arXiv:gr-qc/9604025v2 3 Jun 1996

Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology[*]

Shaken not stirred

P.V. Moniz[†‡]
DAMTP, University of Cambridge
Silver Street, Cambridge, CB3 9EW, UK

DAMTP – R95/53

Abstract

The canonical quantization of $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ supergravity theories is reviewed in this report. A special emphasis is given to the topic of supersymmetric Bianchi class-A and FRW minisuperspaces, namely in the presence of supermatter fields. The quantization of the general theory (including supermatter) is also contemplated. The issue of quantum physical states is subsequently analysed. A discussion on further research problems still waiting to be addressed is included. An extensive and updated bibliography concludes this review.

1 Introduction

Research in supersymmetric quantum gravity and cosmology using canonical methods started about 20 years ago [1]-[4]. Since then, many papers relating to the subject have appeared in the literature [5]-[65]. In this review we will describe how some difficulties (which seemed to disclose a disconcerting future) were sensibly subdued. However, there are still other problems which have not yet been satisfactorily addressed or even considered. In fact, these may constitute additional tests that supersymmetric quantum gravity and cosmology has to confront. By presenting this review in this way, we aim to further motivate the interested reader in following our steps.

The canonical quantization of supergravity theories constitutes a fascinating topic. A theory of quantum gravity is one of the foremost aspirations in theoretical physics [66] and a promising line of approach is the use of nonperturbative methods [67]-[72]. The inclusion of supersymmetry seems to yield significative benefits as well.

Supersymmetry is an attractive concept whose basic feature is a transformation which relates bosons to fermions and vice-versa [73]-[76]. Its promotion to a gauge symmetry has resulted in an elegant field theory: **supergravity** [73]-[85]. One of its more significant features is that the presence of local supersymmetry naturally implies space-time to be curved. Hence, gravity must *necessarally* be present. Supergravity constitutes an extension the general relativity theory of gravity [75]. At large scales, supergravity allows to make the same predictions for classical tests as general relativity. But

---

[*] Topical review for International Journal of Modern Physics – A

[†] e-mail: prlvm10@amtp.cam.ac.uk; PMONIZ@Delphi.com

[‡] URL: http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/user/prlvm10/

at small (microscopic) scales, supergravity quantum effects may instead bring about the cancelation of infinities otherwise present in several appraches to a quantum gravity theory. In particular, supersymmetry may play an important role when dealing with (ultra violet) divergences in quantum cosmology and gravity [72] and removing Planckian masses induced by wormholes [18, 19, 86]. For these and other reasons [75], some researchers hope that nature has reserved a rightful place for supersymmetry and supergravity [73]. Furthermore, it would probably be adequate for the purpose of studying the very early universe to consider scenarios where both bosonic and fermionic matter fields would be present on an equal footing.

The canonical formulation of N=1 (pure) supergravity was presented in ref. [4], following ref. [1]-[3]. N=1 supergravity is a theory with a gauge invariances. Namely, it is invariant under local coordinate, Lorentz and supersymmetry transformations. As standard for theories of this type, these gauge invariances are translated into constraints for the physical variables. Adopting the Dirac quantization procedure (see e.g., ref. [68]-[72]), these constraints become operators applied to physical wave functionals, Ψ, and are subsequently equated to zero. A fundamental feature of the canonical formulation is that in finding a physical state, it would be sufficient to just solve the Lorentz and supersymmetry constraints: the algebra of constraints implies that Ψ will consequently obey the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints[1] as well [2, 4]. For this reason, N=1 supergravity is said to constitute a (Dirac-like) square root of gravity [2]. Notice that the Lorentz and supersymmetry constraints induce a set of coupled *first-order* differential equations for Ψ to satisfy. However, the analysis (in particular, obtaining quantum physical solutions) of the general theory of supergravity is a laborious assignement: one has *infinite* degrees of freedom. Hence, a sensible option is to consider instead simple truncated models.

Spatially homogeneous minisuperspace models have indeed proved to be a very valuable tool in supergravity theories. The study of minisuperspaces have led to important and interesting results, pointing out to useful lines of research. Most of these features have not been contemplated before in far more complicated situations. Moreover, we hope that some of the results present in the minisuperspace sector will hold in the full theory.

The reduction of N=1 supergravity in 4 dimensions to 1-dimensional models through suitable homogeneous ansätze (see ref. [9]-[20], [27]-[34]) leads to minisuperspaces with N=4 local supersymmetry. FRW models are the simplest ones. Bianchi models enable us to consider anisotropic gravitational degrees of freedom and thus more gravitino modes. An important feature is that the fermion number defined by the Rarita-Schwinger (gravitino) field is then a good quantum number. Hence, each sector with a fixed fermion number may be treated separately. Nevertheless, we must be aware of the severe reduction of degrees of freedom that a homogeneity truncation implies. The validity of the minisuperspace approximation in supersymmetric models is yet a problem open for discussion[2].

Using the triad ADM canonical formulation, Bianchi class-A models[3] obtained from pure $N = 1$ supergravity have been studied in ref. [5]-[15] and receive a significant contribution in ref. [13, 14]. Quantum states are described by a wave function of the form $\Psi(e_{AA'i}, \psi_{Ai})$ where $e_{AA'i}$ and ψ_{Ai} denote, respectively, the two-component spinor form of the tetrad and the spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ gravitino field. The wave function is then expanded in even powers of ψ_{Ai}, symbolically represented by ψ^0, ψ^2, ψ^4 up to ψ^6, because of the anti-commutations relations of the six spatial components of the gravitino fields (see ref. [9, 10, 22, 23, 27] and section 3).

---

[1] The factor ordering in the Hamiltonian constraint is determined by how fermionic derivatives are ordered in the supersymmetry constraints, through their anti-commutation relations. When establishing the ordering of the fermionic derivatives we usually assume that the supersymmetry constraints should describe the left and right handed supersymmetry transformations [4]. When considering reduced minisuperspace models, different factor ordering have been chosen [12]-[24], [26]-[34].

[2] A detailed analysis regarding the validity of minisuperspace truncation in the context of ordinary quantum cosmology was presented in ref. [87].

[3] Supersymmetry (as well as other considerations) forbids mini-superspace models of class B to be considered in this context.

Prior to ref. [13, 14], solutions were *only* present in the empty ψ^0 (bosonic) and fermionic filled ψ^6 sectors. But this curious result was joined by yet another disturbing one. When a cosmological constant ($\Lambda > 0$) was added, it led to the undesirable situation that *no* physical states but the trivial one, $\Psi = 0$, were found [21, 22, 23, 59]. Regarding the $k = +1$ FRW model, a bosonic state was found, namely the Hartle-Hawking solution [70] for a De Sitter case.

It seemed that the gravitational and gravitino modes that were allowed to be excited contributed in such a way as to give only very simple states or even forbid any physical solutions. However, we could *not* identify both a wormhole [71] and a Hartle-Hawking [70] state in the same spectrum of solutions. Finding one *or* the other depended on homogeneity conditions imposed on the gravitino (cf. ref. [11]). Furthermore, these solutions were shown (see ref. [48, 49]) to have no counterpart in the full theory: states with *finite* number of fermions are *impossible* there. These results seemed then to suggest that minisuperspaces could be useless as models of full supergravity.

These problems were then properly subdued in ref. [13, 14]. The cause for the disconcerting results mentioned above was the use (see ref. [9]-[12], [21]-[23]) of an ansatz too restrictive for the ψ^2 and ψ^4 fermionic (middle) sectors. More precisely, gravitational degrees of freedom were not properly taken into account. Hence, only two Lorentz invariants terms in each of the ψ^2 and ψ^4 sectors were allowed. These sectors included only the modes of the gravitino field. However, there may be actually up to 15 such invariants in these sectors, when the gravitational modes are rightfully considered[4]. All the 15 amplitudes are assembled in terms of a single one which must satisfy a Wheeler-DeWitt equation. As a consequence, nontrivial solutions were then found in ref. [13, 14] for *all* the fermionic sectors, of which infinitely many have fermion number 2 and 4. Thus, these physical states may have direct analogues in *full* supergravity. Furthermore, supersymmetric minisuperspaces recover their significance as models of the general theory of supergravity. For a particular factor ordering, the (Hawking-Page) wormhole solution [71] is obtained in the ψ^0 sector *and* the (Hartle-Hawking) no-boundary solution [70] in the ψ^4 fermionic sector. I.e., in the same spectrum of solutions.

Nevertheless, the improved approach of ref. [13, 14] could not be straightforwardly employed to solve the cosmological constant conundrum: terms with Λ with violate fermionic number conservation in each fermionic sector of Ψ. Only an *extension* of the ideas present in [13, 14] using Ashtekar variables [69] allowed this problem to be solved (cf. ref. [24]). Solutions have the form of exponentials of the $N = 1$ supersymmetric Chern-Simons functional, in consistency with ref. [62, 64].

With respect to $k = +1$ FRW models obtained from pure N=1 supergravity, specific ansätze for the gravitational and gravitino fields were employed in ref. [16]-[20] (see ref. [27]-[29], [32]-[34] as well). The quantum constraint equations are very simple and the Hartle–Hawking wave-function was found.

The introduction of matter (usually denoted as *supermatter*) in N=1 supergravity led to new and challenging results. A scalar supermultiplet, constituted by complex scalar fields, $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ and their spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ partners, $\chi_A, \bar{\chi}_{A'}$ was considered in ref. [17]-[20], [26]-[33] for FRW models. A vector supermultiplet, formed by gauge vector fields $A_\mu^{(a)}$ and fermionic partners, was added in ref. [28, 29].

A wormhole state was found in ref. [19] but not in ref. [27]. The more general theory of N=1 supergravity with gauged supermatter (see ref. [76]) was employed in ref. [27]. The reason for the discrepancy in ref. [19, 27] was addressed in ref. [32, 33] and identified with the type of Lagrange multipliers and fermionic derivative ordering that we could use.

---

[4] For the case of a FRW model without supermatter and due to the restriction of the gravitino field to its spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ mode component [17], the "old" ansatz for the wave function used in ref. [9]-[12], [21]-[23]remains valid.

As far as a Hartle-Hawking solution is concerned, most of the solutions found in the literature bear *some* of its properties. Unfortunately, the form of the supersymmetry constraints that were used could not determine the dependence of Ψ on the scalar field (cf. ref. [32, 33]). Some interesting improvements towards this direction were made in ref. [39, 40]. By employing $\phi = re^{i\theta} = \phi + i\phi_2$ we were able to effectively decouple the two degrees of freedom associated with the complex scalar fields. The supersymmetry constraints became more manageable and a pleasant consequent of this approach was to provide a sensible framework where to discuss if conserved currents can be defined in supersymmetric quantum cosmology [39, 40].

Within the more general matter content of ref. [76], the results found in ref. [28, 29] were quite unanticipated. The only allowed physical state was $\Psi = 0$! This motivated further research present in ref. [34], where some discussion concerning the results in [28, 29] can be found. For a FRW model but solely in the presence of a vector supermultiplet we found *non-trivial* solutions in different fermionic sectors [34]. Among these we can identify (part of) the no-boundary solution [70, 88] and another state which could be (up to some extent) interpreted as a quantum wormhole state [71, 89]. Overall, the results above mentioned strongly suggest that the treatments of supermatter do need a revision. Moreover, it seems quite clear that this issue has not yet been sucessfully addressed.

A Bianchi type-IX model coupled to a scalar supermultiplet was studied in ref. [30, 31]. This model bears important differences as far as FRW models with supermatter are concerned. Namely, anisotropic gravitational degrees of freedom are now present. In addition, the gravitino spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ modes can now be included [22, 23, 31]. As a consequence, their presence may play an important role, revealing some of the features of the full theory of N=1 supergravity with supermatter.

Models with a richer structure can be found from *extended* supergravities [73, 74], [80]-[85]. These are supergravity theories with more gravitinos[5] and have additional symmetries which couple several physical variables.

The canonical quantization of Bianchi class-A models in $N = 2$ supergravity was addressed in ref. [35, 36]. It was found that the presence of the Maxwell field in the supersymmetry constraints leads to a *non*-conservation of the fermion number. This then implies a mixing between Lorentz invariant fermionic sectors in the wave function. It should be stressed that the intertwining between different fermionic sectors in minisuperspaces obtained in $N = 1$ supergravity with supermatter is *different* from the mixing now caused by the Maxwell field.

Another crucial step towards a better understanding of the canonical quantization of N=1 supergravity is to relate the set of states found in supersymmetric minisuperspaces with any physical states obtained in the full theory. It was shown in ref. [48, 49] that the physical states of full N=1 pure supergravity can only have infinite fermionic number. Recently, a relation between the minisuperspace sector and the general theory was proposed in ref. [13, 14]. A (formal) quantum state with infinite number of fermions was then found in ref. [50]. A wormhole state could be identified but the same was not possible for a Hartle-Hawking solution. The generalization of the canonical formalism of N=1 supergravity [4] to include supermatter fields was subsequently described in ref. [25, 26, 31].

We hope this rather detailed introduction has motivated the reader to bear with us for what follows. We will emphasize some of the technical aspects found in supersymmetric quantum cosmology. In this way, anyone enthusiastic to persue this line of research will get a fair view of *which* and *how* problems have been dealt with. We we will describe the main achievements and point out to further issues waiting for adequate explanations. In reviewing a subject of this type where there are a large number of related topics, solutions and approaches, a decision has to be taken with respect to how much information to include. We hope to have made this review self-contained and useful as a reference, while keeping it clear and readable.

---

[5] $N = 1$ supergravity is the simplest theory [73, 76] with *one* real massless gravitino. $N = 0$ corresponds to ordinary general relativity. $N = 2$ supergravity [73, 80, 84] realises Einstein's dream of unifying gravity with electromagnetism. This theory contains 2 gravitinos besides the gravitational and Maxwell fields. It was in this theory that finite probabilities for loop diagrams with gravitons were first obtained. In particular, the photon-photon scattering process which is divergent in a Einstein-Maxwell theory, was shown to be finite when $N = 2$ supergravity was considered (cf. ref. [73], [85] and references therein).

The review henceforth presented is organized as follows. The canonical quantization of the general theory of N=1 supergravity is described in section 2. In section 2.1 we summarize the basic results for pure N=1 supergravity (see subsection 2.1.1), and include the generalization for all matter fields (see subsection 2.1.2). The issue of finding physical states in the general theory is addressed in section 2.2 and a solution is described in section 2.3. In section 3 we will then analyse the canonical quantization of supersymmetric minisuperspaces. We will employ here a ADM metric representation point of view, together with a differential operator representation for the fermionic variables[6] Subsection 3.1 includes models obtained from pure N=1 supergravity, while a cosmological constant term is added in subsection 3.2. Bianchi class A models are discussed in subsections 3.1.1 and 3.2.1, while the particular case of FRW models is addressed in 3.1.2 and 3.2.2. FRW models are also explored in subsection 3.3, where supermatter fields are then brought into study. Their canonical quantization is presented in subsection 3.3.1. Models with scalar supermultiplets are used in 3.3.2, while in 3.3.3 we add a vector supermultiplet. FRW models with only vector supermultiplets are described in subsection 3.3.4. A Bianchi-IX model in the presence of scalar supermultiplets is analysed in 3.3.5. Bianchi class-A models derived from N=2 supergravity are explored in section 4. Finally, section 5 includes a discusion on the results obtained so far in supersymmetric quantum cosmology. In addition, an outlook on further research projects in canonical quantum supergravity still waiting to be satisfactorily addressed is included.

2 Canonical quantization of N=1 supergravity

This subject is quite long and only a brief summary will be presented here. Some problems and related issues will be discussed, together with some recent results. Before we proceed, the following should be pointed out. The basic features and issues of supersymmetry, supergravity and related concepts will *not* be addressed here in detail. That would go far beyond the scope and aim of this review. The reader interested on such topics is therefore invited to consult, e.g., ref. [73]-[76].

2.1 General formalism

In this subsection we will describe some features of the Hamiltonian formulation of N=1 supergravity and its canonical quantization [4, 25, 26, 31, 48, 49, 50]. The original treatments can be found in ref. [1]-[4].

2.1.1 Pure N=1 supergravity

---

[6] It is our thinking that a differential operator representation for the fermionic variables constitute the rightfull approach. It is totally consistent with the existence of second-class constraints and subsequent Dirac brackets. These then imply that fermionic variables and their Hermitian conjugates are intertwined within a canonical coordinate-momentum relation [3, 4, 9]-A24. There are, however, other approaches. Ashtekar and loop variables were used in [55]-[65]. The method employed in [43]-[47] is based on a $\sigma-$model approach to supersymmetric quantum mechanics. Finally, a matrix representation for the gravitinos was used in ref. [5]-[8]. All these approaches share some similarities but also have specific differences in method and results. Moreover, a clear analysis establishing *if* (up to any extent) and *how* they are related is yet to be achieved.

The action of pure N=1 supergravity is taken to be [4, 73]

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} (\det e) R + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{\mu} e_{AA'\nu} D_{\rho} \psi^{A}{}_{\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) \right] , \tag{1}$$

where κ^2 denotes 8π times the gravitational constant. Here R represents the Ricci scalar curvature, calculated from $e^{AA'}_{\mu}$ and $\psi^{A}_{\mu}, \bar{\psi}^{A'}_{\mu}$. $e^{AA'}_{\mu}$ is the spinorial form of the tetrad e^{a}_{μ}. $e^{AA'}{}_{i}$ gives the three-metric according to $h_{ij} = -e^{AA'}{}_{i}\, e_{AA'j}$. It is given by $e^{AA'}{}_{i} = e^{a}{}_{i} \sigma_{a}{}^{AA'}$, where $e^{a}{}_{i}$ are the spatial tetrad components and $\sigma_{a}{}^{AA'}$ are the Infeld–van der Waerden translation symbols [3, 4, 73, 74, 76]. $\psi^{A}_{\mu}, \bar{\psi}^{A'}_{\mu}$ denote the gravitino (Rarita-Schwinger) fields and a "overline" represents the Hermitian conjugate (H.c.).

These variables transform under supersymmetry - $\delta_{(s)}$ -, Lorentz - $\delta_{(L)}$ - and local coordinate transformations - $\delta_{(lc)}$ - as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{(s)} e^{AA'}{}_{\mu} &= -i\kappa \left(\epsilon^{A} \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{\mu} + \bar{\epsilon}^{A'} \psi^{A}{}_{\mu} \right) , && (2) \\
\delta_{(s)} \psi^{A}{}_{\mu} &= \frac{2}{\kappa} D_{\mu} \epsilon^{A} , && (3) \\
\delta_{(L)} e^{AA'}{}_{\mu} &= N^{A}{}_{B} e^{BA'}{}_{\mu} + \bar{N}^{A'}{}_{B'} e^{AB'}{}_{\mu} , && (4) \\
\delta_{(L)} \psi^{A}{}_{\mu} &= N^{A}{}_{B} \psi^{B}{}_{\mu} , && (5) \\
\delta_{(lc)} e^{AA'}{}_{\mu} &= \xi^{\nu} \partial_{\nu} e^{AA'}{}_{\mu} + e^{AA'}{}_{\nu} \partial_{\mu} \xi^{\nu} , && (6) \\
\delta_{(lc)} \psi^{A}{}_{\mu} &= \xi^{\nu} \partial_{\nu} \psi^{A}{}_{\mu} + \psi^{A}{}_{\nu} \partial_{\mu} \xi^{\nu} , && (7)
\end{aligned}$$

together with the H.c. of (3), (5), (7).

The derivative operator D_{μ} acts on spinor-valued forms and only notices their spinor indices, but not their space-time indices, e.g.,

$$D_{\mu} \psi^{A}{}_{\nu} = \partial_{\mu} \psi^{A}{}_{\nu} + \omega^{A}{}_{B\mu} \psi^{B}{}_{\nu} . \tag{8}$$

Notice the connection forms $\omega^{ab}{}_{\mu} = \omega^{[ab]}{}_{\mu}$ in their spinorial version $\omega^{AB}{}_{\mu}$ (cf. [3, 4, 73]) with $\omega^{AB}{}_{\mu} = {}^{s}\omega^{AB}{}_{\mu} + \kappa^{AB}{}_{\mu}$. Here $\kappa^{\nu\rho}{}_{\mu}$ is the contorsion tensor, related to the torsion $S^{AA'}{}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{i\kappa^2}{2} \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{[\mu} \psi^{A}{}_{\nu]}$, and ${}^{s}\omega^{AB}{}_{\mu}$ is the usual torsion-free connection [4].

From the action (1) the canonical momenta to $\psi^{A}_{i}, \bar{\psi}^{A'}_{i}$ are

$$\pi_{A}{}^{i} = -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{j} e_{AA'k} \ , \ \bar{\pi}_{A'}{}^{i} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} \psi^{A}{}_{j} e_{AA'k} \ . \tag{9}$$

Expressions (9) constitute (second-class) constraints (see, e.g., ref. [72] for more details on this and related topics). In fact, notice that (1) is linear in $D_{\rho}\psi^{A}_{\mu}, D_{\rho}\bar{\psi}^{A'}_{\mu}$. We can then eliminate $\pi_{A}{}^{i}$ and $\bar{\pi}_{A'}{}^{i}$ as dynamical variables through the second-class constraints (9). Consequently, the basic dynamical variables in the theory can then be reduced to $e^{AA'}{}_{i}$, $p_{AA'}{}^{i}$, $\psi^{A}{}_{i}$, and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{i}$, where $p_{AA'}{}^{i}$ is the momentum conjugate to $e^{AA'}{}_{i}$. The momentum $p_{AA'}{}^{i}$ can be expressed in terms of the extrinsic curvature K_{ij}. This one includes, besides the usual symmetric part dependent on the tetrad variables, an anti-symmetric part due to torsion (i.e., gravitino fields) [4].

Poisson brackets can be defined in a classical theory containing both bosons and fermions [3, 4, 17]. After the elimination $\pi_{A}{}^{i}$ and $\bar{\pi}_{A'}{}^{i}$ we find the following Dirac brackets ($[\ ]_D$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[e^{AA'}{}_{i}(x), e^{BB'}{}_{j}(x') \right]_{D} &= 0 \ , \left[e^{AA'}{}_{i}(x), p_{BB'}{}^{j}(x') \right]_{D} = \epsilon^{A}{}_{B} \epsilon^{A'}{}_{B'} \delta_{i}{}^{j} \delta(x, x') \ , && (10) \\
\left[p_{AA'}{}^{i}(x), p_{BB'}{}^{j}(x') \right]_{D} &= \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^{jln} \psi_{Bn} D_{AB'kl} \varepsilon^{ikm} \bar{\psi}_{A'm} \delta(x, x') + \text{H.c.} \ , && (11)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\psi^{A}{}_{i}(x), \psi^{B}{}_{j}(x')\right]_{D} &= 0 \ , \left[\psi^{A}{}_{i}(x), \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{j}(x')\right]_{D} = -D^{AA'}{}_{ij}\delta(x,x') && (12) \\ \left[e^{AA'}{}_{i}(x), \psi^{B}{}_{j}(x')\right]_{D} &= 0 \ , \ \left[p_{AA'}{}^{i}(x), \psi^{B}{}_{j}(x')\right]_{D} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ikl}\psi_{Al}D^{B}{}_{A'jk}\delta(x,x') \ , && (13) \end{aligned}$$

and Hermitian conjugate relations, where ϵ^{AB} is the alternating spinor and

$$D^{AA'}{}_{jk} = -2ih^{-1/2}e^{AB'}{}_{k}e_{BB'j}n^{BA'} \ . \tag{14}$$

Because of the invariance of the Lagrangian density in eq. (1) under local Lorentz transformations, these variables obey the primary constraints $J_{AB} = 0, \bar{J}_{A'B'} = 0$, where

$$J_{AB} = e_{(A}{}^{A'i}p_{B)A'i} + \psi_{(A}{}^{i}\pi_{B)i} \ . \tag{15}$$

The Hamiltonian takes a form of the standard type for theories with gauge invariances:

$$H = \int d^{3}x \left(N\mathcal{H}_{\perp} + N^{i}\mathcal{H}_{i} + \psi^{A}{}_{0}S_{A} + \bar{S}_{A'}\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{0} - M_{AB}J^{AB} - \bar{M}_{A'B'}\bar{J}^{A'B'} \right) \ . \tag{16}$$

The procedure to find explicit expressions for the constraints is simple. It requires the calculation of the conjugate momenta of the dynamical variables and then evaluate the Hamitonian (16). In the case of the supersymmetry constraits, e.g., we read out the coefficients of ${\psi_{0}}^{A}$ and ${\bar{\psi}_{0}}^{A'}$ from this expression in order to get the S_A and $\bar{S}_{A'}$ constraints, respectively. In fact, N, N^{i}, $\psi^{A}{}_{0}$, $\tilde{\psi}^{A'}{}_{0}$, M_{AB} and $\bar{M}_{A'B'}$ constitute Lagrange multipliers for the generators $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}$, $\mathcal{H}_{i}$, S_A, $\bar{S}_{A'}$, J^{AB} and $\bar{J}^{A'B'}$, which are formed from the basic variables. Here N and N^i are the lapse and shift [4], $\psi^{A}{}_{0}$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{0}$ are the zero components of $\psi^{A}{}_{\mu}$, $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{\mu}$ [3, 4]. $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}$ gives the generator of (modified) normal displacements applied to the basic Hamiltonian variables, $\mathcal{H}_{i}$ gives the generator of (modified) spatial coordinate transformations, S_A and $\bar{S}_{A'}$ are the generators of supersymmetry transformations, and J^{AB} and $\bar{J}^{A'B'}$ are the generators of local Lorentz transformations. Here 'modified' indicates that a certain amount of supersymmetry and local Lorentz transformations has been added to the coordinate transformation. Classically, the dynamical variables obey the (first-class) constraints

$$\mathcal{H}_{\perp} = 0, \ \mathcal{H}_{i} = 0, \ S_{A} = 0, \ \bar{S}_{A'} = 0, \ J^{AB} = 0, \ \bar{J}^{A'B'} = 0 \ . \tag{17}$$

The symmetries of the theory in Hamiltonian form are most easily understood by rewriting H so that the Lagrange multipliers $M_{AB}, \bar{M}_{A'B'}$ of J^{AB}, $\bar{J}^{A'B'}$ are minus the zero components ω_{AB0}, $\bar{\omega}_{A'B'0}$ of the connection forms [3, 4]. We then get the explicit form of

$$\begin{aligned} S_{A} &= \varepsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}\,{}^{3}D_{j}\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{k} - \frac{1}{2}i\kappa^{2}p_{AA'}{}^{i}\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{i} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\kappa^{2}h^{1/2}n_{AA'}\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{i}e^{BB'}_{i}\bar{\psi}_{B'}{}^{[j}\psi_{B}{}^{i]} - \frac{1}{4}i\kappa^{2}\epsilon^{ijk}n_{AA'}\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_{j}n_{BB'}\bar{\psi}^{B'}{}_{k}\psi^{B}{}_{i} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here the covariant spatial derivative ${}^{3}D_{i}$ acts on spinor-valued spatial forms according to

$${}^{3}D_{i}\psi^{A}{}_{j} = \partial_{i}\psi^{A}{}_{j} + {}^{3}\omega^{A}{}_{Bi}\psi^{B}{}_{j} \ . \tag{19}$$

The spatial connection forms ${}^{3}\omega^{AB}_{i}$ can be expressed as ${}^{3}\omega^{AB}_{i} = {}^{3s}\omega^{AB}_{i} + {}^{3}\kappa^{AB}_{i}$

In a quantum representation Dirac brackets must be replaced by commutators [,] or anticommutators { , }. The quantum state is described by a wave functional, Ψ, depending on $e^{AA'}{}_{i}(x)$ but the fermionic variables $\psi^{A}{}_{i}, \bar{\psi}^{A'}_{i}$ *cannot* be treated on the same footing. Eq. (12) shows that one cannot have a simultaneous eigenstate of $\psi^{A}{}_{i}$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}_{i}$. We may choose $\psi^{A}{}_{i}$, so that we have a wave functional $\Psi\left[e^{AA'}{}_{i}(x), \psi^{A}{}_{i}(x)\right]$, and the operator $\psi^{A}{}_{i}(x)$ is given by multiplication on the left by $\psi^A{}_i(x)$. Then, in order to satisfy the anticommutation relation following from eq. (12), $\bar\psi^{A'}{}_i$ will be given by the operator

$$\bar\psi^{A'}{}_i(x) = -i\hbar D^{AA'}{}_{ji}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^A{}_j(x)}\ , \tag{20}$$

where as before $\psi^A{}_i$ must be brought to the left in any expression before the *functional* derivative $\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^A_j}$ is applied. A representation for the operator $p_{AA'}{}^i(x)$ consistent with (10), (11) is

$$p_{AA'}{}^i(x) = -i\hbar\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i(x)} - \frac{1}{2}i\hbar\varepsilon^{ijk}\psi_{Aj}(x)D^B{}_{A'lk}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^B{}_l(x)}\ . \tag{21}$$

At quantum level

$$\begin{aligned} J_{AB} &= -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar\left[e_B{}^{A'}{}_i\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i} + e_A{}^{A'}{}_i\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{BA'}{}_i} + \psi_{Bi}\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^A{}_i} + \psi_{Ai}\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^B{}_i}\right]\ , && (22)\\ \bar J_{A'B'} &= -\frac{1}{2}i\hbar\left[e^A{}_{B'i}\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i} + e^A{}_{A'i}\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AB'}{}_i}\right]\ . && (23)\end{aligned}$$

The form of $\bar S_{A'}$ given by conjugating eq. (18) has extra $\psi, \bar\psi$ dependence involved through torsion in the derivative ${}^3D_j\psi^A{}_k$. When this is expanded out in terms of the torsion-free derivative ${}^{3s}D_j\psi^A{}_k$ based on the connection ${}^{3s}\omega^{AB}{}_i$ we find that all the $\bar\psi\psi\psi$ terms cancel to give classically $\bar S_{A'} = \varepsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}\ {}^{3s}D_j\psi^A{}_k + \frac{1}{2}i\kappa^2\psi^A{}_i p_{AA'}{}^i$. Quantum mechanically we get

$$\bar S_{A'} = \epsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}\ {}^{3s}D_j\psi^A{}_k + \frac{1}{2}\hbar\kappa^2\psi^A{}_i\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i}\ , \tag{24}$$

where $\hbar$ is the Planck constant. Correspondingly, the operator $S_A = \varepsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}\ {}^{3s}D_j\bar\psi^{A'}{}_k - \frac{1}{2}i\kappa^2 p_{AA'}{}^i\bar\psi^{A'}{}_i$, given by the Hermitian adjoint of eq. (24), is of second order:

$$S_A = i\hbar\ {}^{3s}D_i\left[\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^A{}_i}\right] + \frac{1}{2}i\hbar^2\kappa^2\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i}\left[D^{BA'}{}_{ji}\frac{\delta}{\delta\psi^B{}_j}\right]\ . \tag{25}$$

The supersymmetry and Lorentz transformation properties are all that is required of a physical state. Notice that $\mathcal{H}_{AA'}$ follows from the anti-commutator $\{S_A,\ \bar S_{A'}\} \sim\ \mathcal{H}_{AA'}$, which classically differs from this one by terms linear in J^{AB} and $\bar J^{A'B'}$ [4].

2.1.2 N=1 supergravity with supermatter

The generalization of the canonical formulation of pure N=1 supergravity to include matter fields was described in ref. [25, 26, 31].

Besides its dependence on the tetrad $e^{AA'}{}_\mu$ and the gravitino field $\psi^A{}_\mu, \bar\psi^{A'}{}_\mu$, the most general N=1 supergravity theory coupled to gauged supermatter [76] also includes a vector field $A^{(a)}_\mu$ labelled by an index (a), its spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ partners $\lambda^{(a)}_A, \bar\lambda^{(a)}_{A'}$, a family of scalars Φ^I, Φ^{J^*} and their spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ partners $\chi^I_A, \bar\chi^{J^*}_{A'}$. Its Lagrangian is given in eq. (25.12) of ref. [76]. The indices I, J^* are Kähler indices, and there is a Kähler metric $g_{IJ^*} = K_{IJ^*}$ on the space of Φ^I, Φ^{J^*} (the Kähler manifold), where K_{IJ^*} is a shorthand for $\partial^2 K/\partial\Phi^I\partial\Phi^{J^*}$ with K the Kähler potential. Each index (a) corresponds to an independent (holomorphic) Killing vector field $X^{(a)}$ of the Kähler geometry. Killing's equation implies that there exist real scalar functions $D^{(a)}(\Phi^I, \Phi^{I^*})$ known as Killing potentials.

Analytic isometries that preserve the analytic structure of the manifold are associated with Killing vectors

$$X^{(b)} = X^{I(b)}(\phi^J)\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^I}\ ,\ X^{*(b)} = X^{I^*(b)}(\phi^{J^*})\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^{I^*}}\ . \tag{26}$$

The index (b) labels the Killing vectors and runs over the dimension of the isometry (gauge) group $\hat{G}$. Killing's equation integrability condition is equivalent to the statement that there exist scalar functions $D^{(a)}$ such that

$$g_{IJ^*}X^{J^*(a)} = i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^I}\,D^{(a)}\ ,\ g_{IJ^*}X^{I(a)} = -i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi^{J^*}}\,D^{(a)}\ . \tag{27}$$

The Killing potentials $D^{(a)}$ are defined up to constants $c^{(a)}$. They further satisfy

$$\left[X^{I(a)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^I} + X^{I*(a)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^{I*}}\right]D^{(b)} = -f^{abc}D^{(c)}. \tag{28}$$

This fixes the constants $c^{(a)}$ for non-Abelian gauge groups.

Within the full theory of N=1 supergravity, our field variables are transformed as follows (it should be stressed that eq. (2), (4)–(7) remain valid). Under supersymmetry transformations - $\delta_{(s)}$ - we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{(s)}\psi^A{}_\mu &= \frac{2}{\kappa}\hat{D}_\mu\epsilon^A - \frac{i}{2}C_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB}\epsilon_B g_{IJ^*}\chi^{IC}e^\nu_{CC'}\bar{\chi}^{J^*C'} + \frac{i}{2}\left(g_{\mu\nu}\varepsilon^{AB} + C_{\mu\nu}{}^{AB}\right)\epsilon_B\lambda^{(a)C}e^\nu_{CC'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C'} \\
&- \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^J}\delta_{(s)}\phi^J - \frac{\partial K}{\partial\bar{\phi}^{J^*}}\delta_{(s)}\bar{\phi}^{J^*}\right)\psi^A_\mu + ie^{K/2}Pe^{AB'}_\mu\bar{\epsilon}_{B'}\ , && (29)\\
\delta_{(s)}A^{(a)}_\mu &= i\left(\epsilon^A e_{\mu AA'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)A'} - \lambda^{(a)A}e_{\mu AA'}\bar{\epsilon}^{A'}\right), && (30)\\
\delta_{(s)}\lambda^{(a)}_A &= -\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^J}\delta_{(s)}\phi^J - \frac{\partial K}{\partial\bar{\phi}^{J^*}}\delta_{(s)}\bar{\phi}^{J^*}\right)\lambda^{(a)A} - iD^{(a)}\epsilon_A + \hat{F}^{(a)}_{\mu\nu}C^{\mu\nu}{}_A{}^B\epsilon_B\ , && (31)\\
\delta_{(s)}\phi^I &= \sqrt{2}\epsilon_A\chi^{IA}, && (32)\\
\delta_{(s)}\chi^I_A &= i\sqrt{2}e^\mu_{AA'}\bar{\epsilon}^{A'}\left(\tilde{D}_\mu\phi^I - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}\psi_{\mu C}\chi^{IC}\right) - \Gamma^I_{JK}\delta_{(s)}\phi^J\chi^K_A \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^J}\delta_{(s)}\phi^J - \frac{\partial K}{\partial\bar{\phi}^{J^*}}\delta_{(s)}\bar{\phi}^{J^*}\right)\chi^I_A - \sqrt{2}e^{K/2}g^{IJ^*}D_{J^*}P^*\epsilon_A\ , && (33)
\end{aligned}$$

and their Hermitian conjugates, ϵ^{AB} is the alternating spinor [73, 74, 76], where ϵ^A and $\bar{\epsilon}^{A'}$ are odd (anticommuting) fields, $C^{\mu\nu}{}_A{}^B = \frac{1}{4}(e^\mu_{AA'}e^{\nu BA'} - e^\nu_{AA'}e^{\mu BA'})$, $\hat{F}^{(a)}_{\mu\nu} = F^{(a)}_{\mu\nu}\ -i\left(\psi^A_{[\mu}e_{\nu]AA'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)A'}\right.$ $\left.-\bar{\psi}_{A'[\mu}e^{AA'}_{\nu]}\lambda^{(a)}_A\right)$, Γ^I_{JK} is a Christoffel symbol derived from Kähler metric, P is a complex scalar-field dependent analytic potential energy term, $D_I = \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^I} + \frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^I}$, $\hat{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu + \omega_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^J}\tilde{D}_\mu\phi^J - \frac{\partial K}{\partial\bar{\phi}^{J^*}}\tilde{D}_\mu\bar{\phi}^{J^*}\right) +$ $\frac{i}{2}A^{(a)}_\mu ImF^{(a)}$, $\tilde{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu - A^{(a)}_\mu X^{I(a)}$, $F^{(a)} = X^{I(a)}\frac{\partial K}{\partial\phi^I} + iD^{(a)}$.

For Lorentz transformations - $\delta_{(L)}$ - it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{(L)}\phi^I &= 0\ ,\quad \delta_{(L)}\chi^I_A = N_{AB}\chi^{IB}, && (34)\\
\delta_{(L)}A^{(a)}_\mu &= N_\mu{}^\nu A^{(a)}_\nu,\ \delta_{(L)}\lambda^{(a)}_A = N_{AB}\lambda^{(a)B} && (35)
\end{aligned}$$

with their Hermitian conjugates, where $N^{AB} = N^{(AB)}$ and $N^{\mu\nu} = N^{[\mu\nu]}$.

Under local coordinate transformations - $\delta_{(lc)}$ -

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{(lc)}A^{(a)}_\mu &= \xi^\nu\partial_\nu A^{(a)}_\mu + A^{(a)}_\nu\partial_\mu\xi^\nu\ , && (36)\\
\delta_{(lc)}\lambda^{(a)}_A &= \xi^\nu\partial_\nu\lambda^{(a)}_A\ , && (37)\\
\delta_{(lc)}\phi^I &= \xi^\nu\partial_\nu\phi^I,\ \delta_{(lc)}\chi^I_A = \xi^\nu\partial_\nu\chi^I_A, && (38)
\end{aligned}$$

considering the Hermitians conjugates as well.

Finally, for gauge transformations - $\delta_{(\mathrm{g})}$ - we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{(\mathrm{g})}\psi^A_\mu &= -\frac{i}{2}\zeta^{(a)}ImF^{(a)}\psi^A_\mu,\ \delta_{(\mathrm{g})}\phi^I = \zeta^{(a)}X^{I(a)}, &(39)\\
\delta_{(\mathrm{g})}\chi^I_A &= \zeta^{(a)}\frac{\partial X^{I(a)}}{\phi^J}\chi^J_A + \frac{i}{2}\zeta^{(a)}ImF^{(a)}\chi^I_A, &(40)\\
\delta_{(\mathrm{g})}A^{(a)}_\mu &= \partial_\mu\zeta^{(a)} + k^{abc}\zeta^{(b)}A^{(c)}_\mu, &(41)\\
\delta_{(\mathrm{g})}\lambda^{(a)}_A &= k^{abc}\zeta^{(b)}\lambda^{(c)}_A - \frac{i}{2}\zeta^{(b)}ImF^{(b)}\lambda^{(b)}_A, &(42)
\end{aligned}$$

and Hermitian conjugates.

The total Hamiltonian includes now $A^{(a)}_0 Q_{(a)}$, where $Q_{(a)}$ is the generator of gauge invariance. For the gravitino and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fields, the corresponding canonical momenta give again (second-class) constraints [31, 90]. These are eliminated when Dirac brackets are introduced. Nontrivial Dirac brackets can be made simple as follows [25, 26, 31].

The brackets involving $p_{AA'}{}^i$, $\psi^A{}_i$ and $\bar\psi^{A'}{}_i$ can be simplified as in the case of pure $N = 1$ supergravity [4] by using (21). The Φ^K and Φ^{K^*} dependence of K_{IJ^*} is responsible for unwanted Dirac brackets among χ^I_A, $\bar\chi^{J^*}_A$, π_{Φ_L} and $\pi_{\Phi^*_L}$. In fact, defining π_{IA} and $\bar\pi_{I^*A'}$ to be the momenta conjugate to χ^{IA}, and $\bar\chi^{I^*A'}$, respectively, one has $\pi_{IA} + \frac{ih^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\ K_{IJ^*}n_{AA'}\bar\chi^{J^*A'} = 0$, $\bar\pi_{J^*A'} + \frac{ih^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\ K_{IJ^*}n_{AA'}\chi^{IA} = 0$. $n^{AA'}$ is the spinor version of the unit normal n^μ, with $n_{AA'}n^{AA'} = 1$, $n_{AA'}e^{AA'}{}_i = 0$. One cures this through $\hat\chi_{IA} = h^{\frac{1}{4}}K^{\frac{1}{2}}_{IJ^*}\delta^{KJ^*}\chi_{KA}$, $\hat{\bar\chi}_{I^*A'} = h^{\frac{1}{4}}K^{\frac{1}{2}}_{JI^*}\delta^{JK^*}\bar\chi_{K^*A'}$. Here $K^{\frac{1}{2}}_{IJ^*}$ denotes a "square root" of the Kähler metric, obeying $K^{\frac{1}{2}}_{IJ^*}\delta^{KJ^*}K^{\frac{1}{2}}_{KL^*} = K_{IL}$. This may be found by diagonalizing K_{IJ^*} via a unitary transformation, assuming that the eigenvalues are all positive. One needs to assume that there is an "identity metric" δ^{KJ^*} defined over the Kähler manifold.

Finally, the brackets among $\hat p_{AA'}{}^i$, $\lambda^{(a)}_A$, $\bar\lambda^{(a)}_{A'}$, $\hat\chi^I_A$ and $\hat{\bar\chi}^{J^*}_{A'}$ are dealt with by defining (see ref. [25, 26, 31, 91]) $\hat\lambda^{(a)}_A = h^{\frac{1}{4}}\lambda^{(a)}_A$, $\hat{\bar\lambda}^{(a)}_{A'} = h^{\frac{1}{4}}\bar\lambda^{(a)}_{A'}$ and then going to the *time gauge* (cf. ref. [90]). In this case, the tetrad component n^a of the normal vector n^μ is restricted by $n^a = \delta^a_0 \Leftrightarrow e^0{}_i = 0$. Thus the original Lorentz rotation freedom becomes replaced by that of spatial rotations. In the time gauge, the geometry is described by the triad $e^\alpha{}_i (\alpha = 1, 2, 3)$, and the conjugate momentum[7] is $p_\alpha{}^i$. All the resulting Dirac brackets are either the same as in subsection 2.1.1 or zero, except the nonzero fermionic brackets like

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\hat\lambda^{(a)}_A(x), \hat{\bar\lambda}^{(b)}{}_{A'}(x)\right]_D &= \sqrt{2}in_{AA'}\delta^{(a)(b)}\delta(x, x')\ , &(43)\\
\left[\hat\chi^I{}_A(x), \hat{\bar\chi}^{J^*}{}_{A'}(x')\right]_D &= \sqrt{2}in_{AA'}\delta^{IJ^*}\delta(x, x')\ , &(44)\\
\left[\psi^A{}_i(x), \bar\psi^{A'}{}_j(x')\right]_D &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}D^{AA'}{}_{ij}\delta(x, x'). &(45)
\end{aligned}$$

The full Hamiltonian contains arbitrary Lorentz rotations. For our present case, these ought surely include the components which depend on the supermater fields. By employing again the redefinition $M_{AB} \mapsto \omega_{AB0}$ and H.c., the Lorentz contributions will contribute with *new* terms of the type $\psi\chi\bar\chi$, $\psi\lambda\bar\lambda$ and their Hermitian conjugates to the supersymmetry constraints [31]. We notice that this last step is *missing* in the procedure employed in ref [25, 26]. In the end of this section we further discuss the implications of its absence and which problems its presence solves.

---

[7] Notice that $\pi^{ij} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}p^{(ij)} = \frac{1}{2}e^{AA'(i}p^{j)}_{AA'} = -\frac{1}{2}e^{\alpha(i}p^{j)}_\alpha$ where the last equality follows from the time gauge conditions (see ref. [3, 4, 25, 26, 31]).

The supersymmetry constraint $\bar{S}_{A'}$ is then found to be

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{S}_{A'} &= -\sqrt{2} i e_{AA'i} \psi^{A}{}_{j} \pi^{ij} + \sqrt{2} \epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'i}\ {}^{3s}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{j} \psi^{A}{}_{k} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Big[\pi_{J^*} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{LM^*} \Gamma^{M^*}_{J^* N^*} n^{BB'} \bar{\chi}^{N^*}{}_{B'} \chi^{L}{}_{B} \\
&- \frac{i h^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} K_{J^*} g_{MM^*} n^{BB'} \bar{\chi}^{M^*}{}_{B'} \chi^{M}{}_{B} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{ijk} K_{J^*} e^{BB'}{}_{j} \psi_{kB} \bar{\psi}_{iB'} \\
&- w_{[1]} \sqrt{2} h^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{IJ^*} \chi^{IB} e_{BB'}{}^{m} n^{CB'} \psi_{mC} \Big] \bar{\chi}^{J^*}{}_{A'} \\
&- \sqrt{2} h^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{IJ^*} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{i} \Phi^{I} \bar{\chi}^{J^*}_{B'} n^{BB'} e_{BA'}{}^{i} + w_{[2]} \frac{i}{2} g_{IJ^*} \epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'j} \psi^{A}{}_{i} \bar{\chi}^{J^* B'} e_{BB'k} \chi^{IB} \\
&+ w_{[3]} \frac{1}{4} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_{Ai} \left(e_{BA'}{}^{i} n^{AC'} - e^{AC'i} n_{BA'} \right) g_{IJ^*} \bar{\chi}^{J^*}_{C'} \chi^{IB} \\
&- h^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(K/2) \left[2P n^{A}{}_{A'} e_{AB'}{}^{i} \tilde{\psi}^{B'}{}_{i} + i (D_I P) n_{AA'} \chi^{IA} \right] \\
&- \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \pi^{n(a)} e_{BA'n} \lambda^{(a)B} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{ijk} e_{BA'k} \lambda^{(a)B} F^{(a)}_{ij} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} g D^{(a)} n^{A}{}_{A'} \lambda^{(a)}{}_{A} \\
&+ w_{[4]} \frac{1}{4} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_{Ai} \left(e_{BA'}{}^{i} n^{AC'} - e^{AC'i} n_{BA'} \right) \bar{\lambda}^{(a)}_{C'} \lambda^{(a)B} - \frac{i}{4} h^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{BB'} \lambda^{(a)}{}_{B} \bar{\lambda}^{(a)}{}_{B'} K_{J^*} \bar{\chi}^{J^*}{}_{A'},
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where $\lambda^{(a)}_{A}$, $\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}_{A'}$ and χ_{IA}, $\bar{\chi}_{I^*A'}$ should be redefined as indicated above. The other supersymmetry constraint S_A is just the Hermitian conjugate of (46). The $w_{[i]}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ denote numerical coefficients which correspond to the inclusion of the terms $\psi\chi\bar{\chi}$, $\psi\lambda\bar{\lambda}$ and their Hermitian conjugates to the supersymmetry constraints via $\omega_{AB0} J^{AB}$ and Hermitian conjugate. In addition, ${}^{3s}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{j} \psi^{A}{}_{k} = \partial_{j} \psi^{A}{}_{k} + {}^{3s}\omega^{A}{}_{Bj} \psi^{B}{}_{k} + \frac{1}{4}(K_{K} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{j} \Phi^{K} - K_{K^*} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{j} \Phi^{K^*}) \psi^{A}{}_{k} + \frac{1}{2} g A^{(a)}_{j} (Im F^{(a)}) \psi^{A}{}_{k}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{i} A^{K} = \partial_{i} A^{K} - g A^{(a)}_{i} X^{K(a)}$, with g the gauge coupling constant and $X^{K(a)}$ the ath Killing vector field. $\pi^{n(a)}$ is the momentum conjugate to $A^{(a)}_{n}$.

The gauge generator $Q^{(a)}$ is given classically by

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^{(a)} = - &\ \partial_{n} \pi^{n(a)} - f^{abc} \pi^{n(b)} A^{(c)}_{n} + \pi_{I} X^{I(a)} + \pi_{I^*} X^{I^*(a)} \\
+ &\ \sqrt{2} i h^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{MI^*} n^{AA'} X^{J^*(a)} \Gamma^{I^*}_{J^* N^*} \bar{\chi}^{N^*}_{A'} \chi^{M}_{A} \\
- &\ \sqrt{2} i h^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{AA'} \bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_{A'} \left[f^{abc} \lambda^{(c)}_{A} + \frac{1}{2} i (Im F^{(a)}) \lambda^{(b)}_{A} \right] \\
+ &\ \sqrt{2} i h^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{AA'} K_{IJ^*} \bar{\chi}^{J^*}_{A'} \left[\frac{\partial X^{I(a)}}{\partial \Phi^{J}} \chi^{J}_{A} + \frac{1}{2} i Im F^{(a)} \chi^{I}_{A} \right] \\
- &\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} Im F^{(a)} \epsilon^{ijk} \bar{\psi}_{iA'} e^{AA'}{}_{j} \psi_{Ak}\ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where f^{abc} are the structure constants of the Kähler isometry group.

It is worthwhile to notice that we expect now to obtain the correct transformation properties (cf. ref. [76]) of the physical fields under supersymmetry transformations, using the brackets $\delta_{\xi} \psi^{A}_{i} \equiv [\bar{\xi}_{A'} \bar{S}^{A'}, \psi^{A}_{i}]_{D}$, etc. Here $\bar{\xi}^{A'}$ is a constant spinor parametrizing the supersymmetric transformation. In fact, that was *not* possible for some fields, when using the explicit form of the supersymmetry constraints present in ref. [25, 26]. The reasons are as follows. On the one hand, the matter terms in the Lorentz constraints $J_{AB}, \bar{J}_{A'B'}$ were *not* included in the supersymmetry constraints. On the other hand, expressions *only valid* in pure N=1 supergravity were employed to simplify the supersymmetry constraints with supermatter. Namely, the expressions for $S_A = 0, \bar{S}_{A'} = 0$ in pure N=1 supergravity were used to re-write the spatial covariant derivative ${}^{3}\mathcal{D}_{i}$ in terms of its torsion free part ${}^{3s}\mathcal{D}_{i}$ and remaining terms which include the contorsion. When supermatter is present, we expect the different matter fields to play a role in the Lorentz constraints. Some of these terms are then included in the supersymmetry constraints once $\omega^0_{AB}J^{AB}$ and its Hermitian conjugate are employed in the canonical action.

2.2 Why there are *no* bosonic physical states

In this subsection we will point out how physical quantum states in pure N=1 supergravity can only have an infinite number of fermions [48, 49]. Early attempts pretended that bosonic and finite fermion number states were possible [51], but subsequent analysis has shown otherwise [48, 49, 52]. This analysis has pointed to several incorrections, regarding different approaches trying to revive the same inconsistent claims, e.g., [53].

The supersymmetry constraints are the central issue. Since these constraints are homogeneous in the gravitino field $\psi_{Ai}(x)$, it is consistent to look for solutions involving homogeneous functionals of order ψ^n. Such states may be called states with fermion (Grassmann) number n.

Although the form of the supersymmetry constraints (24), (25) suggests that there may be solutions of definite order n in the fermion fields, there are *no* such states for any finite n. For $n=0$, a simple scaling argument assuredly excludes the purely bosonic states discussed in [51, 53]. For $n>0$ (cf. [48, 49] for more details), the argument is based on a mode expansion of the gravitino field. It was then suggested that physical states in supergravity have infinite fermion number. This was confirmed for the free spin-3/2 field and a physical (but yet formal) state was indeed found in ref. [50] (see subsection 2.3).

Let us then consider Lorentz invariant states. An arbitrary state can be expanded in a power series as $\Psi[e_{AA'i},\psi_{Ak}] = \sum_n \Psi^{(n)}[e_{AA'i},\psi_{Ak}]$. Note that odd n states need not be considered because they are not local Lorentz invariant. We shall refer to $\Psi^{(n)}$ as a state of fermion number n. The constraint equations must be satisfied independently by each term $\Psi^{(n)}[e_{AA'i},\psi_{Ak}]$.

Let us consider the case where $\Psi[e_{AA'i},\psi_{Ai}] \equiv \Psi^{(0)}[e_{AA'i}]$ is a functional only of the tetrad $e^a{}_i$, that is $\delta\Psi^{(0)}/\delta\psi_{Ai} = 0$. We shall refer to states of this type as *bosonic states*. In this case, any Lorentz invariant state satisfying $\bar{S}^{A'}\Psi^{(0)} = 0$ automatically satisfies all other constraints, since $S^A\Psi^{(0)}$ vanishes identically. We now show that *no* such solution can exist.

The supersymmetry constraint can be written as

$$\left[\Psi^{(0)}\right]^{-1}\bar{S}\Psi^{(0)} \equiv -\varepsilon^{ijk}e^i{}_{AA'}(D_j\psi^{AA'}_k) + \frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}\psi_{iAA'}\frac{\delta(\ln\Psi^{(0)})}{\delta e^{AA'}_i} = 0\ . \tag{48}$$

A contradiction occurs by using an integrated form of (48) with an arbitrary continuous, spinor test function $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$:

$$\int d^3x\bar{\epsilon}(x)\left[-\varepsilon^{ijk}e^i{}_{AA'}(D_j\psi^{AA'}_k) + \frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}\psi_{iAA'}\frac{\delta(\ln\Psi^{(0)})}{\delta e^{AA'}_i}\right] = 0, \tag{49}$$

for all $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$, $e^{AA'}{}_i(x)$, and $\psi^A_k(x)$.

Let the integral in (49) be I, and let $I' = I+\Delta I$ be the integral when $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$ is replaced by $\bar{\epsilon}(x)e^{-\phi(x)}$ and $\psi^A_i(x)$ is replaced by $\psi^A_i(x)e^{\phi(x)}$, where $\phi(x)$ is a scalar function. Since $\bar{\epsilon}(x)\psi^A_i(x)$ is unchanged, the second term (with the functional derivative) cancels in the difference between I' and I, so that

$$\Delta I = -\int d^3x\varepsilon^{ijk}e^{AA'}_i(x)\bar{\epsilon}_A(x)\psi_{kA}(x)\partial_j\phi(x) = -\int \omega(x)\wedge d\phi(x) \tag{50}$$

with the two-form $\omega(x) = \psi^A_i(x)dx^i \wedge e^{AA'}{}_j(x)\bar{\epsilon}(x)dx^j$. Notice that ΔI is independent of the state $\Psi^{(0)}$. Clearly, it is possible to choose the arbitrary fields $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$, $\phi(x)$, $e^{AA'}_i(x)$ and $\psi_{kA}(x)$ such that (50) is nonvanishing. E.g., consider the case of a three-torus $x^i \in [0,2\pi]$, and with $e^a{}_i = \delta^a_i$, $\psi_{Ak} = \delta_{A1}\delta_{2k}$, $\bar{\epsilon}_{A'} = -\delta_{A'1}f(x)$, $f = \cos x^1$, $\phi = \sin x^1$. Then $\Delta I = \int d^3x f(x)\partial_1\phi(x) = \int d^3x\cos^2(x^1) = 4\pi^3 \neq 0$.

Clearly, if $\Delta I \neq 0$, we cannot have both $I = 0$ and $I' = 0$, so (48) *cannot* be satisfied *for all* $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$, $e^{AA'}{}_i(x)$ and $\psi^A_k(x)$.

Hence, *bosonic* wave functionals are *inconsistent* with the supersymmetry constraints of pure N=1 supergravity.

This result also suggests that there may also be *no* states involving a finite nonzero number of fermion fields. That is, all quantum wave functionals of $N = 1$ supergravity with a finite (zero or nonzero) fermion number would be inconsistent with the supersymmetry constraints. From the free spin-3/2 field case, it was shown in ref. [48] that all wave functionals necessarily contain an infinite number of fermion fields. An extension (under some assumptions) of this reasoning was then made for the case of general N=1 supergravity theory.

Overall, the conclusions in [48, 49] subdued the claims in ref. [51] that N=1 supergravity is finite to all orders. Moreover, recent results in ref. [54] seem to further establish that N=1 supergravity with boundary terms is fully divergent even at one-loop order.

2.3 Solutions with *infinite* fermion number

In this section we will review and summarize the method employed in ref. [50] which allowed for an exact quantum solution of the full theory to be there determined. The interested reader should consult ref. [50] for more details. Such quantum state satisfies all constraints in the metric representation for the general theory of N=1 supergravity.

The form of this solution was actually conjectured in ref. [13, 14]. Namely, that infinitely many physical states may exist having the form $\Psi = S^A S_A G(h_{pq})$. This was quite important, in order to generalize the physical states present in Bianchi models to full supergravity (see section 3).

The new elements that were employed in ref. [50] to obtain physical states are the commutators

$$[H_{AA'}(\vec{x}), S_B(\vec{y})] = -i\hbar\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y})\varepsilon_{AB}\bar{D}^{B'C'}_{A'}(\vec{x})\bar{J}_{B'C'}(\vec{x}) \ , \ \left[H_{AA'}(\vec{x}), \bar{S}_{B'}(\vec{y})\right] = i\hbar\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$$
$$\varepsilon_{A'B'}\left[D^{BC}_A(\vec{x})J_{BC}(\vec{x}) + i\hbar\delta(0)\left(\bar{E}^{C'D'}_A(\vec{x})\bar{J}_{C'D'}(\vec{x}) - n^{AC'}(\vec{x})h^{-1/2}(\vec{x})\bar{S}^{C'}(\vec{x})\right)\right] . \quad (51)$$

The coefficients D, E are Grassmann-odd structure functions. The divergent $\delta(0)$-factor[8] may hide an anomaly and its presence reduces the result presented in ref. [50] to a formal one. To go beyond this level regularization procedures would have to be included.

The physical state found in ref. [50] and conjectured in [13, 14] has the form

$$\Psi = \Pi_{(\vec{x})} S^A(\vec{x}) S_A(\vec{x}) G(e_{iBB'}). \quad (52)$$

It contains a formal product over all space-points, with a bosonic functional G satisfying the Lorentz constraints. The S_B constraint and the J_{AB}, $\bar{J}_{A'B'}$ constraints are automatically satisfied. The $\bar{S}_{B'}$ constraint, after using the generator algebra and the properties of G, is satisfied if

$$\bar{S}_{A'} S_A \ G\left(e_i^{BB'}\right) = 0 \, . \quad (53)$$

It is important to note that the operators $e_i^{AA'}\bar{S}_{A'}S_A$ and $n^{AA'}\bar{S}_{A'}S_A$ are Lorentz-invariant.

A solution of eq. (53) for the Bianchi models is described in subsection 3.1.1 and corresponds to the restriction of the functional $G_0(e^{iAA'}) = \exp[-\frac{1}{2\hbar}\int d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} e_i{}^{AA'} \partial_j e_{kAA'}]$ to the appropriate spatially homogeneous tetrad. Remarkably, (53) *does* have solutions also in the inhomogeneous case. One of which is, surprisingly, again given by the functional G_0. However, while $\bar{J}_{A'B'} G_0 = 0$ is satisfied, we also have that $J_{AB} G_0 \neq 0$. A fully Lorentz-invariant amplitude G is obtained from G_0 after [9]

---

[8] Fortunately, the last commutator in (51) is not needed in the solution of the constraints, and the $\delta(0)$-term therefore does not appear there. The only remaining commutators $[H_{AA'}(x), H_{BB'}(y)]$ are obtained from eqs.(51) via Jacobi-identities.

$$G = \int D\mu[\omega] \exp\left(i\omega^{AB} J_{AB}\right) G_0 \ . \tag{54}$$

The infinite product in (52) can then be written as a Grassmannian path-integral over a Grassmann field $\epsilon^A(\vec{x})$. Applying the factors $S^A(\vec{x})$ explicitely on the functional G and using the identity $\exp(i\omega^{AB} J_{AB})\, G_0 = [\exp(i\omega^{AB} J_{AB}) G_0^2 \exp(-i\omega^{AB} J_{AB})][G_0]^{-1}$ satisfied by G_0, an exact physical state Ψ is found as:

$$\Psi(\{h_{ij}, \bar{\psi}_i^{A'}\}) = \int D[\epsilon^1] D[\epsilon^2] \left\{ \exp\left[- \int d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(\epsilon^A(\vec{x}) \partial_j e_{iAA'}(\vec{x}) \bar{\psi}_k^{A'}(\vec{x}) + \frac{1}{2\hbar} e_i{}^{AA'}(\vec{x}) \partial_j e_{kAA'}(\vec{x}) \right) \right] \right.$$
$$\left. \int D\mu[\omega] \exp\left[\left[\int d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \Omega_C{}^A(\vec{x}) (\partial_j \Omega^C{}_B(\vec{x})) e_{iAA'}(\vec{x}) \left(\epsilon^B(\vec{x}) \bar{\psi}_k^{A'}(\vec{x}) + \frac{1}{2\hbar} e_k^{BA'}(\vec{x}) \right) \right] \right] \right\} \ . \tag{55}$$

This is precisely the solution found in ref. [50] and describes an exact quantum state of the full supergravity field theory.

The amplitude G reduces to $\sim \exp[-\frac{V}{2\hbar} m^{pq} h_{pq}]$ in the spatially homogeneous case indicating that (55) should be interpreted as a wormhole state. Being gravity and supergravity non-linear, it is curious that this result has similarities to the Gaussian form expected for the ground state of a free field (e.g., electromagnetic).

3 Supersymmetric minisuperspaces

Throughout this section we will study in some detail the canonical quantization of supersymmetric minisuperspaces. For edifying purposes we will employ Bianchi type-IX and $k = +1$ FRW models [9]-[34] and generalise our results to class A models [12, 13, 14, 24]. There are two approaches to get supersymmetric Bianchi models. On the one hand, we substitute a specific Bianchi ansatz directly in the classical action, thereby obtaining a reduced model and then quantizing it. On the other hand, we may take the quantum constraints directly from the general theory and use them subject to a Bianchi ansatz. We will make use of both techniques (see, e.g., [92] for a related discussion on their possible equivalence).

3.1 Models from pure N=1 supergravity

Models obtained from pure N=1 supergravity will be considered in this section. A Bianchi type IX model is discussed in subsection 3.1.1. We then proceed to the particular case of closed FRW models in subsection 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Bianchi class A models

Let us consider a Bianchi type-IX model whose 4-metric is given by $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} e^a{}_\mu e^b{}_\nu$, where η_{ab} is the Minkowski metric and the non-zero components of the tetrad $e^a{}_\mu$ are given by

$$e^0{}_0 = N,\ e^1{}_0 = a_1 N^i E^1{}_i,\ e^2{}_0 = a_2 N^i E^2{}_i,\ e^3{}_0 = a_3 N^i E^3{}_i,\ e^1{}_i = a_1 E^1{}_i,\ e^2{}_i = a_2 E^2{}_i,\ e^3{}_i = a_3 E^3{}_i. \tag{56}$$

---

[9] $D\mu[\omega]$ is chosen as the formal direct product of the Haar measure of the $SU(2)$-rotation matrices. $\Omega_A{}^C = [\exp i\omega]_A^C$ (with $\omega_2{}^2 = (\omega_1{}^1)^*$, $\omega_2{}^1 = -(\omega_1{}^2)^*$) represent precisely the $SU(2)-$rotation matrices. See ref. [50] for more details.

Here $E^1{}_i, E^2{}_i, E^3{}_3$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ are a basis of left-invariant one-forms on the unit three-sphere [67, 68] and N, N^i, a_1, a_2, a_3 are spatially constant. We then write

$$h_{ij} = a_1^2 E^1{}_i E^1{}_j + a_2^2 E^2{}_i E^2{}_j + a_3^2 E^3{}_i E^3{}_j \ . \tag{57}$$

In the calculations, we shall repeatedly use the following expression for the connections:

$$\omega_{ABi} n^A{}_{B'} e^{BB'j} = \frac{i}{4}\left(\frac{a_3}{a_1 a_2} + \frac{a_2}{a_3 a_1} - \frac{a_1}{a_2 a_3}\right) E^1{}_i E^{1j} + \\ \frac{i}{4}\left(\frac{a_1}{a_2 a_3} + \frac{a_3}{a_2 a_1} - \frac{a_2}{a_3 a_1}\right) E^2{}_i E^{2j} + \frac{i}{4}\left(\frac{a_2}{a_3 a_1} + \frac{a_1}{a_2 a_3} - \frac{a_3}{a_1 a_2}\right) E^3{}_i E^{3j}. \tag{58}$$

The differential equations obeyed by the wave function are found by studying the quantum constraints of the full theory of supergravity [4], evaluated subject to a simple Bianchi ansatz [10] on the spatial variables $e^{AA'}{}_i, \psi^A{}_i$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i$. We require $\psi^A{}_0, \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_0$ be functions of time only and $\psi^A{}_i$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i$ to be spatially homogeneous in the basis $e^a{}_i$; equivalently, $\psi^A{}_i e^{BB'i}$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i e^{BB'i}$ are functions of time only.

A quantum state may be described by a wave function $\Psi(e^{AA'}{}_i, \psi^A{}_i)$ or equivalently by a wave function $\bar{\Psi}(e^{AA'}{}_i, \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i)$. The two descriptions are related by a fermionic Fourier transform [4, 9, 10]. The wave function $\Psi(e^{AA'}{}_i, \psi^A_{\ i})$ may be expanded in even powers of $\psi^A_{\ i}$, symbolically in the form ψ^0, ψ^2, ψ^4 and ψ^6. In the representation $\bar{\Psi}(e^{AA'}{}_i, \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i)$, these become respectively of the form $\bar{\psi}^6, \bar{\psi}^4, \bar{\psi}^2$ and $\bar{\psi}^0$. This can be better understood by noticing the decomposition $\psi_A^{\ i} e_{BB'i} = \psi_{ABB'}$ with

$$\psi_{ABB'} = -2n^C{}_{B'}\gamma_{ABC} + \frac{2}{3}(\beta_A n_{BB'} + \beta_B n_{AB'}) - 2\varepsilon_{AB} n^C{}_{B'}\beta_C \ , \tag{59}$$

where $\gamma_{ABC} = \gamma_{(ABC)}$ is totally symmetric. The β^A and γ^{BCD} spinors constitute the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$ modes of the gravitino fields, when these are split in irreducible representations of the Lorentz group [73] (see also ref. [4, 48] and eqs. (85), (86) and (87)). The Lorentz constraints (15) imply that Ψ is invariant under Lorentz transformations. A *possible* ansatz for Ψ would be

$$\Psi = A + B\beta_A\beta^A + C\gamma^{BCD}\gamma_{BCD} + D\beta_A\beta^A\gamma^{BCD}\gamma_{BCD} + E\left(\gamma^{BCD}\gamma_{BCD}\right)^2 + F\beta_A\beta^A\left(\gamma^{BCD}\gamma_{BCD}\right)^2 , \tag{60}$$

where A, B, etc are functions of a_1, a_2, a_3. The first term in (60) corresponds to the bosonic ψ^0 part, while the second and third terms in Ψ represent the quadratic sectors. Similarly, the fourth and fifth correspond to the quartic sector and the last term in (60) is just the fermionic filled sector. A term $(\beta^A\gamma_{ABC})^2 = \beta^A\gamma_{ABC}\beta^D\gamma_D{}^{BC}$ can be rewritten, using the anti-commutation of the β's and γ's, as $\beta^E\beta_E\epsilon^{AD}\gamma_{ABC}\gamma_D{}^{BC} \sim (\beta_E\beta^E)\,(\gamma_{ABC}\gamma^{ABC})$. Similarly, any quartic in γ_{ABC} can be rewritten as a multiple of $(\gamma_{ABC}\gamma^{ABC})^2$. Since there are only four independent components of $\gamma_{ABC} = \gamma_{(ABC)}$, only one independent quartic can be made from γ_{ABC}, and it is sufficient to check that $(\gamma_{ABC}\gamma^{ABC})^2$ is non-zero. Now $\gamma_{ABC}\gamma^{ABC} = 2\gamma_{000}\gamma_{111} - 6\gamma_{100}\gamma_{011}$. Hence $(\gamma_{ABC}\gamma^{ABC})^2$ includes a non-zero quartic term $\gamma_{000}\gamma_{100}\gamma_{110}\gamma_{111}$.

Consider first the (bosonic) ψ^0-part $A(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ of the wave function. It automatically obeys the constraint $S_A\Psi = 0$, since this involves differentiation with respect to $\psi^A_{\ i}$ (see eq. (25)). The only remaining constraint is $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$.

---

[10] It should be noted that this simple ansatz is *not* invariant under homogeneous supersymmetry transformations. To obtain an ansatz invariant under supersymmetry, one must use a *non-diagonal* triad $e^a{}_i = b^a{}_b E^b{}_i$, where b_{ab} is symmetric ($a, b, = 1, 2, 3$ here), combined with supersymmetry, homogeneous spatial coordinate and local Lorentz transformations [10, 16, 17].

Evaluated at a Bianchi IX geometry the constraint $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ reads

$$\epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'i} \, {}^{3s}\omega^{A}{}_{Bj} \psi^{B}{}_{k} \Psi - \frac{1}{2}\kappa^2 \psi^{A}{}_{i} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_{i}} = 0 \ . \tag{61}$$

Since the homogeneous fields $\psi^{A}{}_{i}$ are otherwise arbitrary, they may be cancelled in eq. (61). Notice that the torsion-free connections have the form

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{3s}\omega^{00}{}_{i} &= X_i + iY_i \ , \ {}^{3s}\omega^{11}{}_{i} = X_i - iY_i \ , && (62) \\ {}^{3s}\omega^{01}{}_{i} &= {}^{3s}\omega^{01}{}_{i} = \frac{1}{4} i \left(-\frac{a_1}{a_2} - \frac{a_2}{a_1} + \frac{a_3^2}{a_1 a_2} \right) E^{3}{}_{i} \ , && (63) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$X_i = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{a_3}{a_1} + \frac{a_1}{a_3} - \frac{a_2^2}{a_1 a_3} \right) E^{2}{}_{i} \ , \ Y_i = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{a_3}{a_2} + \frac{a_2}{a_3} - \frac{a_1^2}{a_2 a_3} \right) E^{1}{}_{i} \ . \tag{64}$$

One can then contract $e^{BA'm}$ into eq. (61), to obtain an equation which then is contracted with allowed variations δh_{km} of diagonal Bianchi-IX 3-metrics. This gives for the wave function $A(a_1, a_2, a_3)$, for example,

$$\frac{\partial(\ln A)}{\partial a_1} = \int d^3x \frac{\delta(\ln A)}{\delta h_{km}(x)} \frac{\partial h_{km}(x)}{\partial a_1} = -\kappa^{-2} a_1 \int d^3x h^{\frac{1}{2}} \ , \tag{65}$$

where $\int d^3x h^{\frac{1}{2}} = 16\pi^2$ is the volume of the compact 3-space with $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 1$. Similar expressions for $\partial(\ln A)/\partial a_2$ and $\partial(\ln A)/\partial a_3$ lead to

$$A \sim \exp(-I) \ , I = \pi \left(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 \right) . \tag{66}$$

Using equation $S_A \bar{\Psi} = 0$, one gets $E \sim \exp(I)$. Hence the bosonic and fermionic filled states of the theory both have very simple *semi-classical* forms.

With respect to the quadratic and quartic fermionic components of Ψ, ansatz (60), constitutes a rather restrictive choice. An unimaginable consequence of the supersymmetry constraints was then that *no* states are possible in the intermediate sectors of ψ^2 and ψ^4 order (cf. ref. [9, 10] for more details).

The simple semi-classical form $A \sim e^{-I}$ represents a (Hawking-Page) wormhole [71] quantum state. It is certainly regular at small 3-geometries, and dies away rapidly at large 3-geometries. Moreover, I is the Euclidean action of an asymptotically Euclidean 4-dimensional classical solution, outside a 3-geometry with metric (57), as confirmed by studying the Hamilton–Jacobi equations. These give the classical flow corresponding to the action I. However, $E \sim e^{I}$ is *not* the no-boundary (Hartle–Hawking) [70] state. That conclusion can be reached by checking if $-I$ is the action of a regular Riemannian solution of the classical field equations, with metric (57) prescribed on the *outer* boundary. It is quite satisfactory that the solution $\exp(-I)$ gives a wormhole state for Bianchi-IX but it seems very strange that the Hartle–Hawking state is not allowed by the quantum constraints.

It should be stressed that the above conclusions are easily extended to Bianchi class A models[11]

---

[11] Only the class-A models allow the spatial sections to be compactified by factoring (if necessary) by a discrete subgroup of isometries [67, 68]. Spatial compactness is needed in the argument used here in finding the partial derivatives of the wave function with respect to a_1, a_2 and a_3. However, in the types II, VI_{-1}, VII_0 and $VIII$, the compactification might be expected to eliminate globally defined spatial Killing vector fields, and so make it impossible to have spatially homogeneous triad or gravitino fields.

[12]. More precisely, the physical states are, respectively, given by[12]

$$\psi^0 \rightarrow h^{s/2} e^{\frac{1}{2}\zeta m^{pq} h_{pq}}\ ,\ \psi^6 \rightarrow h^{-s/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\zeta m^{pq} h_{pq}} \Pi_i (\psi_i^A)^2. \qquad (68)$$

Here h is $\det(h_{pq})$ and m^{pq} is defined from the relation $dw^p = \frac{1}{2} m^{pq} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon_{qrs} \omega^r \otimes \omega^s$, where ω^r are basis of left-invariant 1-forms on the space-like hypersurface of homogeneity. The constant symmetric matrix m^{pq} is fixed by the chosen Bianchi type [67]. In addition, the parameter s specifies the *general* ambiguity of the operator ordering arising from the non-commutativity of $\psi_i^A, \bar\psi_j^{A'}$ and $p^{AA'}_{\ \ k}$. We define $\zeta = \frac{2\sigma}{\hbar\kappa^2}$, where σ denotes the volume of spatial sections and κ^2 is again $8\pi^2$ times the gravitational constant. These results (together with the problems described in 3.2.1 concerning the presence of a cosmological constant) were quite disconcerting. In fact, the subject of supersymmetric quantum cosmology was put up to a harsh test and its future seemed in doubt. However, subsequent research present in [13, 14] provided the required breakthrough.

The commutators $[\bar S_{B'},\ H_{AA'}]$ and $[S_B, H_{AA'}]$, which are proportional to Lorentz generators, are the essential new ingredients, on which all of the following is based

In order to show that physical states exist in the 2-fermion sector, let us consider instead the wave-function

$$\Psi_2 = \bar S_{A'} \bar S^{A'} Y(h_{pq}), \qquad (69)$$

where we require, of course, that $\bar S_{A'} \bar S^{A'} Y \neq 0$. This new ansatz for the quadratic fermionic sector (see for ψ^4 below) brings *new* Lorentz invariants to Ψ. This is due to the presence of additional gravitational degrees of freedom that were otherwise absent. A simple example of such an additional invariant is $m^{pq} {\psi_p}^A \psi_{qA}$. Writing out the new expressions present in ψ^2, ψ^4 in an explicit way it can be seen that indeed they contain such additional invariants. Here Y is a function of the h_{pq} only, and therefore, like $\bar S_{A'} \bar S^{A'}$, a Lorentz scalar. Therefore Ψ_2 *automatically* satisfies the Lorentz constraints and the $\bar S$ constraints

The only remaining condition is $S_A \Psi_2 = 0$, which reduces to

$$[H_{AA'} \bar S^A] Y + 2 \bar S^A H_{AA'} Y = 0. \qquad (70)$$

The first term is proportional to J_{AB} and therefore vanishes. The second term vanishes if Y satisfies the Wheeler-DeWitt equation [13, 14]

$$H_{AA'}{}^{(0)} Y(h_{pq}) = 0, \qquad (71)$$

where $H_{AA'}{}^{(0)}$ consists only of the bosonic terms of $H_{AA'}$. Any solution of this Wheeler-DeWitt equation, which may be specified further by imposing, e.g., no-boundary, tunneling or wormhole boundary conditions, generates a solution in the 2-fermion sector.

With respect to the 4-fermion sector, the wave-function $S^A S_A Z(h_{pq})$ automatically satisfies the Lorentz constraints and the S constraint. It remains to satisfy the $\bar S_{A'}$ constraint, which reduces to

---

[12] The solution for ψ^6 is *different* from the corresponding expression in ref. [12]. The extra h factor present in [12] *cannot* be there though. The explicit form can be obtained through a fermionic Fourier transformation [4, 12]

$$\bar\Psi(e^{AA'}_{\ \ p}, \bar\psi^{A'}_{\ q}) = D^{-1}(e^{AA'}_{\ \ p}) \int \Psi(e^{AA'}_{\ \ p}, \psi^{A}_{\ q}) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} C_{AA'}^{\ \ \ pq} \psi^A_{\ p} \bar\psi^{A'}_{\ q}} \Pi_{E,r} d\psi^E_{\ r}\ , \qquad (67)$$

where $C_{AA'}^{\ \ \ pq} = -\sigma \varepsilon^{pqr} e_{AA'r}\ ,\ D(e_{AA'p}) = \det\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar} C_{AA'}^{\ \ \ pq}\right)$. This allows to obtain the wave function in the representation $\bar\Psi(e^{AA'}_{\ \ p}, \bar\psi^{A'}_{\ q})$ and leads to a factor of h^{-1} (via $D^{-1}(e^{AA'}_{\ \ p})$). In particular, it intertwines different representations, where equations are substantially easier to derive. But the inverse transformation does *not* involve a factor of h; see ref. [4] for the reasons of this asymmetry. This remark should also be employed when confronting the powers of h in (68) coincides with the ones in ref. [13] and [9, 10, 14].

$\left(\left[H_{AA'}, S^A\right] + 2S^A H_{AA'}\right) Z(h_{pq}) \prod_{r=1}^{3}(\psi_r^A)^2 = 0$. The first term in the bracket is expanded in terms containing the Lorentz generators or S_A. The terms containing the Lorentz generators vanish as they act on Lorentz scalars. In the end, it is enough [13, 14] if Z satisfies the Wheeler-DeWitt equation

$$\left({H_{AA'}}^{(1)} - \frac{\hbar^2}{16\pi^2 h^{1/2}} n^{AA'} \right) g(h_{pq}) = 0, \tag{72}$$

where ${H_{AA'}}^{(1)}$ consists of those terms of $H_{AA'}$ which remain if the terms in $p_i^{AA'}$ are brought to the *left* and then equated to zero.

A generalization of these solutions for the case of full supergravity was provided in ref. [50] and briefly described in subsection 2.3. The algebra of the constraints has a similar form. Hence, the physical states found in the ψ^2, ψ^4 sectors are direct minisuperspace analogues of states in full supergravity. While the states in the empty and filled sectors would span at most a 2-dimensional Hilbert space, these physical states identified in the middle fermionic sectors would span an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, just as in the Bianchi models of pure gravity.

3.1.2 Closed FRW models

When considering FRW geometries in pure N=1 supergravity, the tetrad and gravitino fields ought to be chosen accordingly. This *can only be possible* for a suitable combination of supersymmetry, Lorentz and local coordinate transformation.

Closed FRW universes have S^3 spatial sections. The tetrad of the four-dimensional theory can be taken to be:

$$e_{a\mu} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} N(\tau) & 0 \\ 0 & a(\tau)E_{\hat{a}i} \end{array} \right] , \; e^{a\mu} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} N(\tau)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & a(\tau)^{-1}E^{\hat{a}i} \end{array} \right] , \tag{73}$$

where $\hat{a}$ and i run from 1 to 3. $E_{\hat{a}i}$ is a basis of left-invariant 1-forms on the unit S^3 with volume $\sigma^2 = 2\pi^2$.

This ansatz reduces the number of degrees of freedom provided by $e_{AA'\mu}$. If supersymmetry invariance is to be retained, then we need an ansatz for $\psi^A{}_\mu$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_\mu$ which reduces the number of fermionic degrees of freedom. We take $\psi^A{}_0$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_0$ to be functions of time only. We further take

$$\psi^A{}_i = e^{AA'}{}_i \bar{\psi}_{A'} \; , \; \bar{\psi}^{A'}{}_i = e^{AA'}{}_i \psi_A \; , \tag{74}$$

where we introduce the new spinors ψ_A and $\bar{\psi}_{A'}$ which are functions of time only. This means we truncate the general decomposition $\psi^A{}_{BB'} = e_{BB'}{}^i \psi^A{}_i$ in (59) at the spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ mode level. I.e., with $\beta^A = \frac{3}{4} n^{AA'} \bar{\psi}_{A'} \sim \bar{\psi}^A$. This constitutes a direct consequence of assuming a FRW geometry and it is a necessary condition for supersymmetry invariance to be retained. It is also important to stress that auxiliary fields are also required to balance the number of fermionic and bosonic degrees of freedom. However, these auxiliary fields can be neglected in the end (cf. ref. [16, 17]). The above ansätze preserves the form of the tetrad under a *suitable combination* of supersymmetry, Lorentz and local coordinate transformations (2)-(7). I.e., we get [17, 20, 34]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta e_i^{AA'} &= \left(-N^{AB} + a^{-1}\xi^{AB} + i\kappa\epsilon^{(A}\psi^{B)} \right) e_B{}^{A'}{}_i \\ &+ \left(-\bar{N}^{A'B'} + a^{-1}\bar{\xi}^{A'B'} + i\kappa\bar{\epsilon}^{(A'}\bar{\psi}^{B')} \right) e^A{}_{B'i} + \frac{i\kappa}{2} \left(\epsilon_C \psi^C + \bar{\epsilon}_{C'} \bar{\psi}^{C'} \right) e^{AA'}{}_i \; , \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where $\xi^{AB}, N^{AB}, \epsilon^A$ and Hermitian conjugates parametrize local coordinate, Lorentz and supersymmetry transformations, respectively. Notice that the ansatz for the tetrad is preserved, i.e., $\delta e_i^{AA'} \equiv P_1 \left[e_\mu^{AA'}, \psi_i^A \right] e_1^{AA'}$, provided that the relations

$$N^{AB} - a^{-1}\xi^{AB} - i\kappa\epsilon^{(A}\psi^{B)} = 0 \; , \; \bar{N}^{A'B'} - a^{-1}\bar{\xi}^{A'B'} - i\kappa\bar{\epsilon}^{(A'}\bar{\psi}^{B')} = 0 \; , \tag{76}$$

between the generators of Lorentz, coordinate and supersymmetry transformations are satisfied.

The ansatz for the fields ${\psi^A}_i$ and ${\bar{\psi}^{A'}}_i$ should also be preserved under the same combination of transformations, together with (75), (76). Hence [17, 20, 34]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\psi^A_i &= \frac{3i\kappa}{4}\epsilon^A\psi^B\bar{\psi}^{B'}e_{BB'i} + a^{-1}\bar{\xi}^{A'B'}{e^A}_{B'i}\bar{\psi}_{A'} \\ &+ \left[\frac{2}{\kappa}\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{aN}+\frac{i}{a}\right) - \frac{i\kappa}{2N}\left(\psi_F{\psi^F}_0 + \bar{\psi}_{F'0}\bar{\psi}^{F'}\right)\right] n_{BA'}{e^{AA'}}_i\epsilon^B \ . \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

and its Hermitian conjugate. The Ansatz for ${\psi^A}_i$ is then preserved, i.e., $\delta\psi^A_i \equiv P_2\left[e^{AA'}_\mu, \psi^A_i\right]e^{AA'}_i\bar{\psi}_{A'}$, if we impose the additional constraint $\psi^B\bar{\psi}^{B'}e_{BB'i} = 0$ and take $\bar{\xi}^{A'B'} = 0$. The former constitutes basically a reduced form of the Lorentz constraint in the full theory and is present in the two equivalent forms [16, 17]:

$$J_{AB} = \psi_{(A}\bar{\psi}^{B'}n_{B)B'} = 0 \ , \bar{J}_{A'B'} = \bar{\psi}_{(A'}\psi^B n_{BB')} = 0 \ . \tag{78}$$

It should be stressed that the invariance of $\psi^A_i, \bar{\psi}^{A'}_i$ strongly depends on the last term of (77). The only option was to put the other terms as equal to zero. Notice that solely ${}^3D_i\epsilon_A$ is able to produce $\delta\psi^A_i \equiv P_2\left[e^{AA'}_\mu, \psi^A_i\right]e^{AA'}_i\bar{\psi}_{A'}$ (see ref. [17, 34] for further details). By requiring that the constraint (78) be preserved under the same combination of transformations as used above, one finds equations which are satisfied provided the supersymmetry constraints $S_A = 0$, $\bar{S}_{A'} = 0$ hold. By further requiring that the supersymmetry constraints be preserved, one finds additionally that the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H} = 0$ should hold.

By imposing the above mentioned symmetry conditions, we obtain a one-dimensional (mechanical) model depending only on t. Classically, the constraints vanish, and this set of constraints forms an algebra. The constraints are functions of the basic dynamical variables. For the gravitino fields, their canonical momenta produce (second-class) constraints. These are eliminated when Dirac brackets are introduced [4, 72, 90] instead of the original Poisson brackets.

It is useful to make slight redefinitions of the dynamical fields. We let $a \mapsto \frac{\kappa}{\sigma}a$, $\psi^A \mapsto \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}\frac{\sigma^{1/2}}{(\kappa a)^{3/2}}}\psi^A$ and $\bar{\psi}^{A'} \mapsto \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}\frac{\sigma^{1/2}}{(\kappa a)^{3/2}}}\bar{\psi}^{A'}$. We include the constraint $J_{AB} = 0$ by adding $M^{AB}J_{AB}$ to the Lagrangian, where M^{AB} is a Lagrange multiplier. In order to achieve the simplest form of the generators and their Dirac brackets, we make the following redefinitions of the non-dynamical variables N, ${\psi^A}_0$, ${\bar{\psi}^{A'}}_0$ and M^{AB}:

$$\hat{N} = \frac{\sigma N}{12\kappa} \ , \ \rho^A = \frac{i(\kappa\sigma)^{1/2}}{2\sqrt{6}a^{1/2}}{\psi^A}_0 + \frac{i\sigma N}{12\kappa a^2}n^{AA'}\bar{\psi}_{A'} \ , \tag{79}$$

$$L^{AB} = M^{AB} - \frac{(\kappa\sigma)^{1/2}}{3\sqrt{6}a^{3/2}}\psi^{(A}{}_0\psi^{B)} - \frac{2(\kappa\sigma)^{1/2}}{3\sqrt{6}a^{3/2}}\bar{\psi}^{(A'}{}_0\bar{\psi}^{B')}{n^A}_{A'}{n^B}_{B'} \ , \tag{80}$$

and Hermitian conjugates. Our constraints then take the rather simple form [16, 17, 20]

$$S_A = \psi_A\pi_a - 6ia\psi_a, \ H = -a^{-1}(\pi_a^2 + 36a^2), \ \bar{S}_{A'} = \bar{\psi}_{A'}\pi_a + 6ia\bar{\psi}_{A'}, \ J_{AB} = \psi_{(A}\bar{\psi}^{B'}n_{B)B'} \ . \tag{81}$$

The presence of the free parameters ρ_A, $\bar{\rho}_{A'}$ shows that this model has $N = 4$ local supersymmetry in 1 dimension.

In solving the supersymmetry constraints $S_A, \bar{S}_{A'}$ in (81), note that $J^{AB}\Psi = 0$ implies that Ψ can be written as $\Psi = A + B\psi_A\psi^A$, where A and B depend only on a. The solutions are

$$\Psi = C\exp[-3a^2/\hbar] + D\exp[3a^2/\hbar]\psi_A\psi^A \ , \tag{82}$$

where C and D are independent of a and ψ^A. The exponential factors have a *semi-classical* interpretation as $\exp(-I/\hbar)$, where I is the Euclidean action for a classical solution outside or inside a three-sphere of radius $\frac{\kappa}{\sigma}a$ with a prescribed boundary value of ψ^A. I.e., we get a Hartle-Hawking solution for $C = 0$.

3.2 Models with a cosmological constant

It is of interest to study more general locally supersymmetric actions, initially in Bianchi models. Possibly the simplest of such generalization is the addition of a cosmological constant, Λ, in $N = 1$ supergravity (see ref. [21, 22, 23, 93] and references therein).

3.2.1 Bianchi class A models

For the ansatz (60) we shall see that we *cannot* find any non-trivial physical quantum states for Bianchi class A models [21, 22, 23, 59].

The action for N=1 supergravity (1) includes now the additional terms

$$S = -\int d^4x(\det e)\left[(2\kappa^2)^{-1}3g^2 - \frac{1}{2}g\ (\psi^A{}_\mu e_{AB'}{}^\mu e_B{}^{B'\nu}\psi^B{}_\nu)\right] + \text{H.c.} \tag{83}$$

Here g represents the cosmological constant through the relation $\Lambda = \frac{3}{2}g^2$.

The corresponding quantum constraints read

$$\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = -i\hbar g h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^A{}_{A'}{}^i n_{AB'} D^{BB'}{}_{ji}\left(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\psi^B{}_j}\right) + \epsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}\omega^A{}_{Bj}\psi^B{}_k\Psi - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\kappa^2\psi^A{}_i\frac{\delta\Psi}{\delta e^{AA'}{}_i} = 0\ , \tag{84}$$

with the corresponding Hermitian conjugate. We have made the replacement $\delta\Psi/\delta\psi^B{}_j \longrightarrow h^{\frac{1}{2}}\partial\Psi/\partial\psi^B{}_j$. The $h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ factor is necessary as to ensure that each term has the correct weight in the equations. Namely when we take a variation of a Bianchi geometry whose spatial sections are compact, multiplying by $\delta/\delta h_{ij}$ and integrating over the three-geometry . The cause can be identified in the term $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in expression (14). It can be checked that the inclusion of $h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ gives the correct supersymmetry constraints in the $k = +1$ Friedmann model (see next subsection).

We will use the gravitino field written in terms of the β spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ and γ spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ modes (see eq. (59)), and the following expressions [31]:

$$\frac{\partial(\beta_A\beta^A)}{\partial\psi^B{}_i} = -n_A{}^{B'}e_{BB'}{}^i\beta^A\ ,\ \frac{\partial(\gamma_{ADC}\gamma^{ADC})}{\partial\psi^B{}_i} = -2\gamma_{BDC}\ n^{CC'}e^D{}_{C'}{}^i, \tag{85}$$

$$\frac{\partial\beta_A}{\partial\psi^B{}_j} = -\frac{1}{2}n_A{}^{B'}e_{BB'}^{\ \ j}\ ,\ \frac{\partial\gamma^{ADC}}{\partial\psi^B{}_j} = \frac{1}{3}\left(n^{CC'}e^D{}_{C'}{}^j\epsilon_B{}^A + n^{AC'}e^C{}_{C'}{}^j\epsilon_B{}^D + n^{DC'}e^A{}_{C'}{}^j\epsilon_B{}^C\right). \tag{86}$$

We can also write out β^A and γ_{BDC} in terms of $e^{EE'}{}_j$ and $\psi^E{}_j$ as

$$\beta_A = -\frac{1}{2}n_A^{A'i}e^i_{BA'}\psi^B_i\ ,\ \gamma_{ABC} = \frac{1}{3}\left(n_C^{C'}e_{BC'}^{\ i}\psi_{Ai} + n_A^{C'}e_{CC'}^{\ i}\psi_{Bi} + n_B^{C'}e_{AC'}^{\ i}\psi_{Ci}\right). \tag{87}$$

First consider the $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ constraint at the level ψ^1 in powers of fermions. Since it holds for all $\psi^B{}_i$, we can take the gravitino terms out. From multiplying this equation by $e^{BA'm}$, we obtain by taking a variation among the Bianchi-IX metrics, that

$$\hbar\kappa^2\frac{\partial A}{\partial a_1} + 16\pi^2 a_1 A + 6\pi^2\hbar g a_2 a_3 B = 0\ , \tag{88}$$

and two others given by cyclic permutation of a_1, a_2, a_3.

Next we consider the $S_A\Psi = 0$ constraint at order ψ^1. Using expressions (85)–(87), we divide again by ${\psi^B}_j$. Multiplying by ${n^A}_{D'}e^{BD'n}$, then multiplying by different choices $\delta h_{im} = \partial h_{im}/\partial a_1$ etc. and integrating over the manifold, we find the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{16}\hbar^2\kappa^2 a_1^{-1}\left(a_i\frac{\partial B}{\partial a_i}\right) - \frac{1}{3}\hbar\kappa^2\left[3\frac{\partial C}{\partial a_1} - A^{-1}\left(a_i\frac{\partial C}{\partial a_i}\right)\right] - 16\pi^2 g a_2 a_3 A \\ - \;& \pi^2\hbar a_2 a_3\left(\frac{a_1}{a_2a_3} + \frac{a_2}{a_1a_3} + \frac{a_3}{a_1a_2}\right)B + \frac{1}{3}(16\pi^2)\hbar a_2 a_3\left(\frac{2a_1}{a_2a_3} - \frac{a_2}{a_3a_1} - \frac{a_3}{a_1a_2}\right)C = 0\ , \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

and two more equations given by cyclic permutation of a_1, a_2, a_3.

Now consider the $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ constraint at order ψ^3. It will turn out that we need go no further than this. From this constraint we can set separately to zero the coefficient of $\beta^C(\gamma_{DEF}\gamma^{DEF})$, the symmetrized coefficient of $\gamma_{DEF}(\beta_C\beta^C)$ and the symmetrized coefficient of $\gamma_{FGH}(\gamma_{CDE}\gamma^{CDE})$. From here we derive three equations and from following similar steps as above (cf. ref. [22, 23]) we get

$$\frac{3}{4}16\pi^2\hbar g a_1a_2a_3 D + \frac{2}{3}g16\pi^2\ \left(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right)C + \frac{2}{3}\hbar\kappa^2\left(a_i\frac{\partial C}{\partial a_i}\right) = 0\ ,. \tag{90}$$

and

$$3\hbar\kappa^2\frac{\partial B}{\partial a_1} - \hbar\kappa^2 A^{-1}\left(a_i\frac{\partial B}{\partial a_i}\right) - 16\pi^2 a_2a_3\left(\frac{a_3}{a_1a_2} + \frac{a_2}{a_1a_3} - 2\frac{a_1}{a_2a_3}\right)B = 0 \tag{91}$$

and two more equations given by permuting a_1, a_2, a_3 cyclically. The equation (91) also holds with B replaced by C.

Consider first the equation (91). It can be checked that these are equivalent to

$$\hbar\kappa^2\left(a_1\frac{\partial B}{\partial a_1} - a_2\frac{\partial B}{\partial a_2}\right) = 16\pi^2\left(a_2^2 - a_1^2\right)B \tag{92}$$

and cyclic permutations. We can then integrate eq. (92) and ciclically, along a characteristic $a_1a_2 =$ const., $a_3 =$ const., say, using the parametric description $a_1 = w_1e^{\tau}$, $a_2 = w_2e^{-\tau}$, to obtain in the end

$$B = f(a_1a_2a_3)\exp\left[-\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar\kappa^2}\ \left(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right)\right]\ , \tag{93}$$

and similarly for C. Substituting these back in (89), we get a set of equations whose only solution is $C = 0$. The equation (89) and its cyclic permutations, with $C = 0$, must be solved consistently with eq. (88) and its cyclic permutations. Eliminating A, one finds $B = 0$ and subsequently $A = 0$. Then we can argue using the duality mentioned in subsection 3.1.1 that $D = E = F = 0$. Hence there are *no* physical quantum states obeying the constraint equations in the diagonal Bianchi-IX model *if* Ψ has the form given by anasatz (60). The same conclusion can be generalized for the case of Bianchi class A models [23, 59].

These vexatious results motivated the research described in ref. [13, 14] and were only properly dealt with in ref. [24]. In fact, the doubts thereby raised are entire legitemate: even though canonical quantum supergravity has more constraints than ordinary quantum gravity, it has surely much more degrees of freedom than gravity. According to [24], non trivial solutions can be found by employing Ashtekar variables [69]. In particular, we take the complexified spin-connection $\mathcal{A}_{pAB}$ and the tensor density $\sigma^{pAB} = -\left(\sqrt{2}\right)^{-1}\varepsilon^{pqr}{e_q}^{AA'}{e_r}^{B}{}_{A'}$ as a canonically conjugate pair of coordinates.

The transformation from the $\mathcal{A}_p^{AB}$-representation to the $e_p^{AA'}$- representation requires the generalized Fourier-transform

$$\Psi\left(e_p{}^{AA'}\right)=\int\left[\prod_p\prod_{(A\leq B)} d\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}\right] e^{-\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}e_{qA}{}^{A'}e_{rBA'}\varepsilon^{pqr}}\,\Psi\left(\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}\right), \tag{94}$$

along a suitable 9-dimensional contour chosen in order to achieve convergence, and permitting partial integration without boundary terms. Apart from this condition the contour may still be chosen arbitrarily. There are different possible choices corresponding to different linearly independent solutions. In addition, a similarity tranformation has to be performed which takes the form

$$\Psi(e_p{}^{AA'})\mapsto e^{-8\pi^2 m^{pq}e_p{}^{AA'}e_{qAA'}}\Psi(e_p{}^{AA'}). \tag{95}$$

A special class of solutions (undoubtedly, more general solutions exist) is

$$\Psi\sim\exp\left[i\left(F(\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB},\psi_p{}^A)+G(\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB})\right)\right]\ , \tag{96}$$

with

$$F\sim-\frac{1}{\Lambda}\left(16\pi^2 m^{pq}\psi_p{}^A\psi_{qA}+\varepsilon^{pqr}\psi_p{}^A\mathcal{A}_{qA}{}^B\psi_{rB}\right)\ , \tag{97}$$

and where G is independent of the ψ_p^A

$$G\sim\frac{i}{\Lambda}\left(16\pi^2 m^{pq}\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}\mathcal{A}_{qAB}+\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon^{pqr}\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}\mathcal{A}_{qB}{}^C\mathcal{A}_{rCA}\right)\ , \tag{98}$$

The function G can be expressed by the Chern-Simons functional integrated over the spatially homogeneous 3-manifolds, consistently with [62, 63, 94].

The $\mathcal{A}_p^{AB}$ integrals required for the transformation from the Ashketar-representation to the metric representation need further specification. Not all of these integrals need to be done, because only three of the nine degrees of freedom of $\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}$ are physical[13]. However, even the remaining three integrals cannot all be performed analytically. In the limit of vanishing cosmological constant $\Lambda\rightarrow 0$ a stationary-phase approximation becomes possible. We then expand Ψ as

$$\Psi\sim\sum_{n=1}^{3}\frac{\left[iF(\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB},\psi_p{}^A)\right]^n}{n!}e^{iG(\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB})}\,. \tag{99}$$

One stationary phase point is at $\mathcal{A}_p^{AB}=0$. The first solution is therefore defined by chosing a suitable contour passing through this point. In the limit of $\Lambda\rightarrow 0$ the dominant fermion term has 6 ψ_p^A -factors. Then we obtain from the stationary phase at $\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}=0$

$$\Psi(e_p{}^{AA'})\sim\ \text{const}\ \left(\prod_{p=1}^{3}\prod_{A=0,1}\psi_p{}^A\right)e^{\left(-8\pi^2 m^{pq}e_p{}^{AA'}e_{qAA'}\right)}. \tag{100}$$

The exponent corresponds to that of a wormhole state in the 6-fermion sector [13, 14]. A divergent factor $\Lambda^{-3/2}$ has been absorbed in the prefactor.

Other stationary phase points are at $\mathcal{A}_p{}^{AB}\neq 0$ and further solutions are obtained by chosing integration contours through any of them. For the case of a Bianchi IX (cf. ref. [24] for more details):

$$\Psi(b_1,b_2,b_3)\sim\sum_n\frac{i^n}{n!}F^n\int d\mathcal{A}_1 d\mathcal{A}_2 d\mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{A}_3)^2\exp\left[\sum_q\mathcal{A}_{qAB}\sigma^{ABq}+iG(\mathcal{A}_{ABq})\right]\,. \tag{101}$$

---

[13] Six correspond to gauge freedoms (three from basis changes of the 1-forms ω^p, three from Lorentz frame rotations) which can be fixed by a choice of gauge and are not integrated over in that gauge.

Points of stationary phase now satisfy the equations $2\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{A}_2 = 16\pi^2\mathcal{A}_3$ and cyclic. From (101) we then get in the 4-fermion sector the folowing amplitudes

$$\frac{e^{-8\pi^2[(b_1^2+b_2^2+b_3^2)+2(b_1b_2+b_2b_3+b_3b_1)]}}{\Lambda} \, , \, \frac{e^{-8\pi^2[(b_1^2,+b_2^2+b_3^2)+2(b_1b_2-b_2b_3-b_3b_1)]}}{\Lambda} \, , \tag{102}$$

where the exponent in the former corresponds to the Hartle-Hawking state [13, 14, 70] and the other has not been discussed before.

3.2.2 Closed FRW models

In a supersymmetric FRW model with cosmological constant terms, the coupling between the different fermionic levels 'mixes up' the pattern present in 3.1.2. From $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ and $S_A\Psi = 0$ we obtain [22, 23]

$$\hbar\kappa^2\frac{dA}{da} + 48\pi^2 aA + 18\pi^2\hbar g a^2 B = 0 \ , \ \hbar^2\kappa^2\frac{dB}{da} - 48\pi^2\hbar aB - 256\pi^2 g a^2 A = 0 \ . \tag{103}$$

These give second-order equations for $A(a)$ which have two independent solutions, of the form

$$A = c_0 + c_2a^2 + c_4a^4 + \dots \ , \ A = a^3(d_0 + d_2a^2 + d_4a^4 + \dots) \ , \tag{104}$$

convergent for all a. They obey complicated recurrence relations, where c_6 is related to c_4, c_2 and c_0.

We can look for asymptotic solutions of the type $A \sim (B_0 + \hbar B_1 + \hbar^2 B_2 + \dots)\exp(-I/\hbar)$, and finds $I = \pm\frac{\pi^2}{g^2}(1-2g^2a^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}$, for $2g^2a^2 < 1$. The minus sign in I corresponds to taking the action of the classical Riemannian solution filling in smoothly inside the three-sphere, namely a portion of the four-sphere S^4 of constant positive curvature. This gives the Hartle–Hawking state [70]. For $a^2 > (1/2g^2)$, the Riemannian solution joins onto the Lorentzian solution

$$\Psi \sim \cos\left\{\hbar^{-1}\left[\frac{\pi^2\,(2g^2a^2-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{g^2} - \frac{\pi}{4}\right]\right\} \ , \tag{105}$$

which describes de Sitter space-time.

3.3 Models with supermatter

In addressing the presence of (super)matter fields in minisuperspace models we ought to choose the type of action we will employ. Following ref. [76], we will consider N=1 supergravity coupled to the more general gauged supermatter. The corresponding general theory, related properties and features (some of which are relevant in minisuperspaces) were described in subsection 2.1.2. We may take the group $\hat{G} = SU(2)$ as the gauge group in a $k = +1$ FRW model. In this case we have the Killing potentials

$$D^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\phi+\bar{\phi}}{1+\phi\bar{\phi}}\right), \ D^{(2)} = -\frac{i}{2}\left(\frac{\phi-\bar{\phi}}{1+\phi\bar{\phi}}\right), \ D^{(3)} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1-\phi\bar{\phi}}{1+\phi\bar{\phi}}\right) \ , \tag{106}$$

and the Kähler potential is $K = \ln(1+\phi\bar{\phi})$. The corresponding Kähler metric is $g_{\phi\bar{\phi}} = \frac{1}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2}$, $g^{\phi\bar{\phi}} = (1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2$. The Levi-Civita connections of the Kähler manifold are just $\Gamma^{\phi}_{\phi\phi} = g^{\phi\bar{\phi}}\frac{\partial g_{\phi\bar{\phi}}}{\partial\phi} = -2\frac{\bar{\phi}}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}$ and its complex conjugate. The rest of the components are zero.

The simplest choice for the matter fields in a FRW geometry is to take the scalar super-multiplet, consisting of a complex scalar field $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ and spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field $\chi_A, \bar{\chi}_{A'}$ as spatially homogeneous, depending only on time. Similarly, a simple choice for the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ $\lambda_A^{(a)}, \bar{\lambda}_{A'}^{(a)}$, $(a) = 1, 2, 3$, would be to take each component as an arbitrary-time dependent function.

In ordinary quantum cosmology with gauge fields, it is not sufficient for $A_\mu^{(a)}$ to have simple homogenous components. Special ansätze are required for $A_\mu^{(a)}$, depending on the gauge group considered, which then may also affect the choices for ϕ (cf. ref. [88, 89], [95]-[98]). A suitable ansatz for $A_\mu^{(a)}$ requires it to be *invariant up to gauge transformations.* Assuminig a gauge group $\hat{G} = SO(3) \sim SU(2)$, the spin-1 field is taken to be

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu(t)\ \omega^\mu = \left(\frac{f(t)}{4} \varepsilon_{(a)i(b)} \mathcal{T}^{(a)(b)} \right) \omega^i \ , \tag{107}$$

where $\{\omega^\mu\}$ represents the moving coframe $\{\omega^\mu\} = \{dt, \omega^i\}$, $\omega^i = \hat{E}^i{}_{\hat{c}} dx^{\hat{c}}$, $(i, \hat{c} = 1, 2, 3)$, of one-forms, invariant under the left action of $SU(2)$. $\mathcal{T}_{(a)(b)}$ are the generators of the $SU(2)$ gauge group. The idea of this ansatz for a non-Abelian spin-1 field is to define a homorphism of the isotropy group $SO(3)$ to the gauge group. This homomorphism defines the gauge transformation which *compensates* the action of a given $SO(3)$ rotation. Hence, the above form for the gauge field, where the A_0 component is taken to be identically zero. None of the gauge symmetries will survive: all the available gauge transformations are required to cancel out the action of a given $SO(3)$ rotation. Thus, we will not have a gauge constraint[14] $Q^{(a)} = 0$.

3.3.1 Canonical quantization of a FRW model

We will then use the ansätze (73), (74) described in subsection 3.1.2, together with expression (107) and taking $\lambda_A^{(a)} = \lambda_A^{(a)}(t)$. The action of the full theory (Eq. (25.12) in ref. [76]) is reduced to one with a finite number of degrees of freedom. Starting from the action so obtained, we study the Hamiltonian formulation of this model [28, 29].

The contributions from the complex scalar fields $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ to the $\bar{S}_{A'}$ constraint are seen to be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\chi}_{A'} \Big[\pi_{\bar{\phi}} \quad &+ \quad \frac{i\sigma^2 a^3}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\phi}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})} n_{BB'} \bar{\lambda}^{(a)B'} \lambda^{(a)B} - \frac{5i}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sigma^2 a^3 \phi}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^3} n_{BB'} \bar{\chi}^{B'} \chi^B \\ &- \quad \frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sigma^2 a^3 \phi}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})} n_{BB'} \psi^B \bar{\psi}^{B'} - \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sigma^2 a^3}{(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2} n_{BB'} \chi^B \bar{\psi}^{B'} \Big] \\ &+ \quad \frac{\sigma^2 a^2 g f}{\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2} \sigma^a{}_{AA'} n^{AB'} \bar{\chi}_{B'} X^a. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

The contributions to the $\bar{S}_{A'}$ constraint from the spin-1 field are

$$\begin{aligned} &- \quad i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \pi_f \sigma^a{}_{BA'} \lambda^{(a)B} + \frac{\sigma^2 a^3}{6} \sigma^a{}_{BA'} \lambda^{(a)B} n_{CB'} (\sigma^{bCC'} \bar{\psi}_{C'} \bar{\lambda}^{(b)B'} + \sigma^{bAB'} \psi_A \lambda^{(b)C}) \\ &+ \quad \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}} \sigma^2 a^4 \sigma^{(a)C}_{\ \ A'} [1 - (f-1)^2] \lambda^{(a)}{}_C \\ &+ \quad \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 a^3 \lambda^{(a)A} \left(-n_{AB'} \bar{\psi}_{A'} \bar{\lambda}^{(a)B'} + n_{BA'} \psi_A \lambda^{(a)B} - \frac{1}{2} n_{AA'} \psi_B \lambda^{(a)B} + \frac{1}{2} n_{AA'} \bar{\psi}_{B'} \bar{\lambda}^{(a)B'} \right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

---

[14] However, in the case of larger gauge group some of the gauge symmetries will survive. These will give rise, in the one-dimensional model, to local internal symmetries with a reduced gauge group. Therefore, a gauge constraint can be expected to play an important role in that case. The study of such a model would be particularly interesting.

The contributions from the spin-2 field and spin-3/2 field to $\bar{S}_{A'}$ constraint are

$$\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}}a\pi_a\bar{\psi}_{A'} - \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma^2 a^2\bar{\psi}_{A'} + \frac{3}{8}\sigma^2 a^3 n^B{}_{A'}\bar{\psi}^{B'}\psi_B\bar{\psi}_{B'} \ . \tag{110}$$

The following terms are also present in the $\bar{S}_{A'}$ supersymmetry constraint:

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma^2 a^3 g D^a n_{AA'}\lambda^{(a)A} + \frac{\sigma^2 a^3}{\left(1+\phi\bar{\phi}\right)^2}\left(-n_{BA'}\bar{\psi}_{B'} + \frac{1}{2}n_{BB'}\bar{\psi}_{A'}\right)\chi^B\bar{\chi}^{B'} \\
&- \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 a^3\left(n_{AB'}\lambda^{(a)A}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}{}_{A'}\bar{\psi}^{B'} + n_{AA'}\lambda^{(a)A}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}{}_{B'}\bar{\psi}^{B'}\right) \\
&- \frac{1}{4(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2}\sigma^2 a^3\left(n_{AB'}\chi^A\bar{\chi}_{A'}\psi^{B'} + n_{AA'}\chi^A\bar{\chi}_{B'}\psi^{B'}\right) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

The supersymmetry constraint $\bar{S}_{A'}$ is then the sum of the above expressions. The supersymmetry constraint S_A is just the complex conjugate of $\bar{S}_{A'}$. Notice that the above expressions correspond to a gauge group $SU(2)$ and hence a compact Kähler manifold, which implies that the analytical potential $P(\Phi^I)$ is zero [99].

Let us obtain expressions for the quantum supersymmetry constraints. First we need to redefine the fermionic fields, χ_A, ψ_A and $\lambda_A^{(a)}$ in order to simplify the Dirac brackets, following the steps described in [3, 17, 25, 33, 90]. We take

$$\hat{\chi}_A = \frac{\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\chi_A \ , \ \hat{\bar{\chi}}_{A'} = \frac{\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\bar{\chi}_{A'} \ . \tag{112}$$

The conjugate momenta become

$$\pi_{\hat{\chi}_A} = -in_{AA'}\hat{\bar{\chi}}^{A'} \ , \ \pi_{\hat{\bar{\chi}}_{A'}} = -in_{AA'}\hat{\chi}^A \ . \tag{113}$$

This pair forms a set of (second class) constraints. The Dirac bracket is

$$\left[\hat{\chi}_A, \hat{\bar{\chi}}_{A'}\right]_D = -in_{AA'} \ . \tag{114}$$

Similarly for the ψ_A field,

$$\hat{\psi}_A = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}\psi_A \ , \ \hat{\bar{\psi}}_{A'} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}\bar{\psi}_{A'} \ , \tag{115}$$

where the conjugate momenta are

$$\pi_{\hat{\psi}_A} = in_{AA'}\hat{\bar{\psi}}^{A'} \ , \ \pi_{\hat{\bar{\psi}}_{A'}} = in_{AA'}\hat{\psi}^A \ . \tag{116}$$

The Dirac bracket becomes

$$\left[\hat{\psi}_A, \hat{\bar{\psi}}_{A'}\right]_D = in_{AA'} \ . \tag{117}$$

Also for the $\lambda_A^{(a)}$ field:

$$\hat{\lambda}^{(a)}_A = \frac{\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}\lambda^{(a)}_A, \ \ \hat{\bar{\lambda}}^{(a)}{}_{A'} = \frac{\sigma a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}{}_{A'} \ , \tag{118}$$

giving

$$\pi_{\hat\lambda^{(a)}_{A}} = -in_{AA'}\hat{\bar\lambda}^{(a)A'} \ , \ \pi_{\hat{\bar\lambda}^{(a)}_{A'}} = -in_{AA'}\hat\lambda^{(a)A} \ , \tag{119}$$

with

$$\left[\hat\lambda^{(a)}_{A}, \hat{\bar\lambda}^{(b)}_{A'}\right]_D = -i\delta^{ab}n_{AA'} \ . \tag{120}$$

Furthermore,

$$[a, \pi_a]_D = 1 \ , \ [\phi, \pi_\phi]_D = 1 \ , \ [\bar\phi, \pi_{\bar\phi}]_D = 1 \ , \ [f, \pi_f] = 1 \ , \tag{121}$$

and the rest of the brackets are zero.

It is simpler to describe the theory using only unprimed spinors, and, to this end, we define

$$\bar\psi_A = 2n_A^{\ B'}\bar\psi_{B'} \ , \ \bar\chi_A = 2n_A^{\ B'}\bar\chi_{B'} \ , \ \bar\lambda^{(a)}_{A} = 2n_A^{\ B'}\bar\lambda^{(a)}_{B'} \ , \tag{122}$$

with which the new Dirac brackets are

$$[\chi_A, \bar\chi_B]_D = -i\epsilon_{AB} \ , \ [\psi_A, \bar\psi_B]_D = i\epsilon_{AB} \ , \ \left[\lambda^{(a)}_{A}, \bar\lambda^{(a)}_{A'}\right]_D = -i\delta^{ab}\epsilon_{AB} \ . \tag{123}$$

The rest of the brackets remain unchanged. Quantum mechanically, one replaces the Dirac brackets by anti-commutators if both arguments are odd (O) or commutators ifb otherwise (E):

$$[E_1, E_2] = i[E_1, E_2]_D \ , \ [O, E] = i[O, E]_D \ , \ \{O_1, O_2\} = i[O_1, O_2]_D \ . \tag{124}$$

Here, we take units with $\hbar = 1$. The only non-zero (anti-)commutator relations are:

$$\{\lambda^{(a)}_{A}, \lambda^{(b)}_{B}\} = \delta^{ab}\epsilon_{AB} \ , \ \{\chi_A, \bar\chi_B\} = \epsilon_{AB} \ , \ \{\psi_A, \bar\psi_B\} = -\epsilon_{AB} \ , \tag{125}$$

$$[a, \pi_a] = [\phi, \pi_\phi] = [\bar\phi, \pi_{\bar\phi}] = [f, \pi_f] = i \ . \tag{126}$$

We choose $(\chi_A, \psi_A, a, \phi, \bar\phi, f)$ to be the coordinates of the configuration space, and $(\bar\chi_A, \bar\psi_A, \pi_a, \pi_\phi, \pi_{\bar\phi}, \pi_f)$ to be the momentum operators in this representation. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{(a)}_{A} &\rightarrow -\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar\lambda^{(a)A}} \ , \ \bar\chi^A \rightarrow -\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^A}, \ \bar\psi_A \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^A} \ , \\ \pi_a &\rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial a}, \ \pi_\phi \rightarrow -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}, \ \pi_{\bar\phi} \rightarrow -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi} \ , \ \pi_f \rightarrow -i\frac{\partial}{\partial f} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

Some criteria have been presented to determine a suitable factor ordering for the quantum constraints obtained from (108)–(111). The nature of this problem is related to the presence of fermionic cubic terms. Basically, $S_A, \bar S_A$, and the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}$ *could* be chosen by requiring that [17, 19, 32, 33]:

1. $S_A\Psi = 0$ describes the transformation properties of Ψ under right-handed supersymmetry transformations (in the $(\chi_A, \psi_A, a, \phi, \bar\phi, f)$ representation);

2. $\bar S_A\Psi = 0$ describes the transformation properties of Ψ under left-handed supersymmetry transformations (in the $(\chi_A, \psi_A, a, \phi, \bar\phi, f)$ representation);

3. $S_A, \bar S_A$ are Hermitian adjoints with respect to an adequate inner product [5];

4. A Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by consistency of the quantum algebra.

However, not all of these criteria can be satisfied simultaneously (cf. [17, 20]). An arbitrary choice is to satisfy **1, 2, 4** [17, 18, 26]-[29], [32]-[34]. Another possibility (as in ref. [19, 27, 32, 33]) is to go beyond this factor ordering and insist that $S_A, \bar S_A$ could still be related by a Hermitian adjoint operation (requirement **3**). If we adopt this, then there are some quantum corrections to $S_A, \bar{S}_A$. Namely, adding terms linear in ψ_A, χ_A to S_A and linear in $\bar{\psi}_A, \bar{\chi}_A$ to $\bar{S}_A$ which nevertheless *modify* the transformation rules for the wave function under supersymmetry requirements **1, 2.**

Following the ordering used in ref. [4], we put all the fermionic derivatives in S_A on the right. In $\bar{S}_A$ all the fermonic derivatives are on the left. Implementing all these redefinitions, the supersymmetry constraints have the differential operator form

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_A \; = \; & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\chi_A\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}a\psi_A\frac{\partial}{\partial a} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\sigma^2 a^2\psi_A - \frac{5i}{4\sqrt{2}}\bar{\phi}\chi_A\chi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^B} \\
& - \frac{1}{8\sqrt{6}}\psi_B\psi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^A} - \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\bar{\phi}\chi_A\psi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^B} - \frac{5}{4\sqrt{6}}\chi_A\psi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^B} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4\sqrt{2}}\chi^B\psi_B\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^A} \\
& + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\psi_A\chi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^B} + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{6}}\sigma^a{}_{AB'}\sigma^{bCC'}n_D{}^{B'}n^B{}_{C'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)D}\psi_C\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\lambda}^{(b)B}} \\
& + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}\sigma^a{}_{AB'}\sigma^{bBA'}n_D{}^{B'}n^E{}_{A'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_B\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^E} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\psi_A\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\frac{\partial}{\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}} + \frac{3}{8\sqrt{6}}\bar{\lambda}^a{}_A\lambda^{(a)C}\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi^C} \\
& + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\sigma^2 a^3 g\bar{D}^{(a)}\bar{\lambda}^a{}_A - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}}\psi^C\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}_C\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\lambda}^{(a)A}} + \frac{\sigma^2 a^2 g f}{\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\sigma^a{}_{AA'}n^{BA'}\bar{X}^{(a)}\chi_B \\
& + \sigma^a{}_{AA'}n^{BA'}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)}_B\left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\frac{\partial}{\partial f} + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}(1-(f-1)^2)\sigma^2\right)
\end{aligned}
\tag{128}
$$

and $\bar{S}_A$ is just the Hermitian conjugate of (128) using (122).

When matter fields are taken into account the generalisation of the J_{AB} constraint is

$$
J_{AB} = \psi_{(A}\bar{\psi}^{B'}n_{B)B'} - \chi_{(A}\bar{\chi}^{B'}n_{B)B'} - \lambda^{(a)}_{(A}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)B'}n_{B)B'} = 0\ . \tag{129}
$$

One can justify this by observing either that it arises from the corresponding constraints of the full theory, or that its quantum version describes the invariance of the wavefunction under Lorentz transformations. Alternatively, we could consider eq. (29). The second and third terms in (29), allow to reproduce basically the last two terms in eq. (129) (cf. ref. [34] for more details).

The Lorentz constraint J_{AB} implies that a physical wave function should be a Lorentz scalar. We can easily see that the most general form of the wave function is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi \; = \; & A + iB\psi^C\psi_C + C\psi^C\chi_C + iD\chi^C\chi_C + E\psi^C\psi_C\chi^C\chi_C \\
& + c_a\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\chi_C + d_a\lambda^{(a)C}\chi_C + c_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C + e_a\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\chi_C\psi^D\psi_D \\
& + f_a\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\psi_C\chi^D\chi_D + d_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\chi_C\bar{\lambda}^{(a)D}\chi_D + e_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\psi^D\psi_D \\
& + f_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\chi^D\chi_D + g_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\chi^D\psi_D + c_{abc}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\psi_D \\
& + d_{abc}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\chi_D + c_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(d)}_D + h_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\psi^D\psi_D\chi^E\chi_E \\
& + e_{abc}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\chi_D\psi^E\psi_E + f_{abc}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\psi_D\chi^E\chi_E \\
& + d_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(d)}_D\psi^E\psi_E + \nu_3\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\chi_E \\
& + e_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(d)}_D\chi^E\chi_E + f_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(d)}_D\psi^E\chi_E \\
& + g_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\psi_D\bar{\lambda}^{(d)E}\chi_E + \mu_1\bar{\lambda}^{(2)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(1)E}\psi_E \\
& + \mu_2\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(2)E}\psi_E + \mu_3\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\psi_E \\
& + \nu_1\bar{\lambda}^{(2)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(1)E}\chi_E + \nu_2\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(2)E}\chi_E \\
& + F\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_D\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_E + h_{abcd}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\bar{\lambda}^{(c)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(d)}_D\psi^E\psi_E\chi^F\chi_F
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\ \delta_1\bar{\lambda}^{(2)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)E}\psi_E\chi^F\chi_F+\delta_2\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)E}\psi_E\chi^F\chi_F\\
&+\ \delta_3\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\psi_E\chi^F\chi_F+\gamma_1\bar{\lambda}^{(2)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)E}\chi_E\psi^F\psi_F\\
&+\ \gamma_2\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)E}\chi_E\psi^F\psi_F+\gamma_3\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\chi_E\psi^F\psi_F\\
&+\ G\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{E}\psi^F\psi_F+H\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{E}\chi^F\chi_F\\
&+\ I\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{E}\chi^F\psi_F+K\bar{\lambda}^{(1)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(1)}_{C}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)D}\bar{\lambda}^{(2)}_{D}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)E}\bar{\lambda}^{(3)}_{E}\psi^F\psi_F\chi^G\chi_G\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{130}$$

where A, B, C, D, E, etc, are functions of a, ϕ ,$\bar{\phi}$, f only. This ansatz contains all allowed combinations of the fermionic fields and is the most general Lorentz invariant function we can write down.

3.3.2 FRW model with scalar supermultiplets

In this subsection we will restrict ourselves to a model where both the spin-1 field and its fermionic partner are set equal to zero. Such a situation will be less difficult to study as compared with the more demanding case where all matter fields are included. For the cases of a two-dimensional spherically symmetric and flat Kähler geometries we will find that the quantum states have a simple form, but *different* from the ones presented in ref. [19].

The most general Ψ which satisfies the Lorentz constraint $J_{AB}=\psi_{(A}\bar{\psi}_{B)}-\chi_{(A}\bar{\chi}_{B)}$ is

$$\Psi=A+iB\psi^C\psi_C+C\psi^C\chi_C+iD\chi^C\chi_C+E\psi^C\psi_C\chi^C\chi_C\ , \tag{131}$$

where A, B, C, D, and E are functions of a, ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ only. The factors of i are chosen for simplicity.

The next step is to solve the supersymmetry constraints $S_A\Psi=0$ and $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi=0$. We will get four equations from $S_A\Psi=0$ and another four equations from $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi=0$:

$$-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\frac{\partial A}{\partial\phi}=0\ ,\ -\frac{a}{2\sqrt{6}}\frac{\partial A}{\partial a}-\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\sigma^2a^2A=0\ , \tag{132}$$

$$i\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\frac{\partial E}{\partial\bar{\phi}}=0\ ,\ \frac{a}{\sqrt{6}}\frac{\partial E}{\partial a}-\sqrt{6}\sigma^2a^2E=0\ . \tag{133}$$

We can see that (132) and (133) constitute decoupled equations for A and E, respectively. They have the general solution.

$$A=f(\bar{\phi})\exp(-3\sigma^2a^2)\ ,\ E=g(\phi)\exp(3\sigma^2a^2)\ , \tag{134}$$

where f,g are arbitrary anti-holomorphic and holomorphic functions of ϕ, respectively. The other remaining equations are coupled equations between B and C and between C and D, respectively. The first step to decouple these equations is as follows. Let $B=\tilde{B}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $C=\frac{\tilde{C}}{\sqrt{3}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{3}{2}}$, $D=\tilde{D}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We then get

$$(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2\frac{\partial\tilde{B}}{\partial\phi}+\frac{a}{12}\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a}-\frac{7}{12}\tilde{C}+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2a^2\tilde{C}=0\ ,\ \frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial\bar{\phi}}+a\frac{\partial\tilde{B}}{\partial a}-6\sigma^2a^2\tilde{B}-3\tilde{B}=0, \tag{135}$$

$$(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2\frac{\partial\tilde{D}}{\partial\bar{\phi}}-\frac{a}{12}\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a}+\frac{7}{12}\tilde{C}+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2a^2\tilde{C}=0\ ,\ \frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial\phi}-a\frac{\partial\tilde{D}}{\partial a}-6\sigma^2a^2\tilde{D}+3\tilde{D}=0. \tag{136}$$

From (135) we can eliminate $\tilde{B}$ to get a partial differential equation for $\tilde{C}$:

$$(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial\bar{\phi}\partial\phi}-\frac{a}{12}\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\left(a\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a}\right)+\frac{5}{6}a\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a}+\left[3\sigma^4a^4+3\sigma^2a^2-\frac{7}{4}\right]\tilde{C}=0\ , \tag{137}$$

and from (136), we will get another partial differential equation for $\tilde{C}$:

$$(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^2 \frac{\partial \tilde{C}}{\partial \bar{\phi} \partial \phi} - \frac{a}{12} \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \left(a \frac{\partial \tilde{C}}{\partial a} \right) + \frac{5}{6} a \frac{\partial \tilde{C}}{\partial a} + \left[3\sigma^4 a^4 - 3\sigma^2 a^2 - \frac{7}{4} \right] \tilde{C} = 0 \ . \tag{138}$$

We can see immediately that $\tilde{C} = 0$ because the coefficients of $\sigma^2 a^2 \tilde{C}$ are different for these two equations. Using this result, we find

$$B = h(\bar{\phi})(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{1}{2}} a^3 \exp(3\sigma^2 a^2) \ , \ C = 0 \ , \ D = k(\phi)(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{1}{2}} a^3 \exp(-3\sigma^2 a^2) \ . \tag{139}$$

where h, k are holomorphic, anti-holomorphic functions of $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ respectively.

Notice that result (139) is a direct consequence that we could not find a consistent (Wheeler-DeWitt type) second-order differential equation for C and hence to B, D. Expressions (134), (139) are obtained directly from (132), (133) and (135) (136). Moreover, while Lorentz invariance allows the pair $\psi_A \chi^A$ in (131), supersymmetry rejects it. A possible conclusion could be that supersymmetry transformations forbid any fermionic bound state $\psi_A \chi^A$ by treating the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fields ψ^A, χ^B differently.

These results can be strengthened by showing that $C = 0$ is not a consequence of the particular ordering used. In fact, we can try the ordering presented in ref. [19] such that S_A and $\bar{S}_{A'}$ are Hermitian adjoints in the standard inner product (cf. requirements **1** - **4** above). If one allows for the factor ordering ambiguity in S_A due to the terms cubic in fermions, and insists that $\bar{S}_{A'}$ be the Hermitian adjoint of S_A, the *new* operators will have the form

$$S_{A_{new}} = S_A + \lambda \psi_A + i\mu \bar{\phi} \chi_A \ , \ \bar{S}_{A_{new}} = \bar{S}_A + i \left(\frac{7}{4\sqrt{2}} - \mu \right) \bar{\phi} \chi_A + \left(\frac{5}{4\sqrt{6}} - \lambda \right) \bar{\psi}_A \ . \tag{140}$$

Notice that S_A , $\bar{S}_A$ above represent the supersymmetry constraints but with the ordering of [15]. We will find another eight equations. We must set $\mu = \frac{7}{8\sqrt{2}}$ to have a consistent decoupling. The only freedom left to get consistent equations for $\tilde{C}$ is from λ. By setting $B = \tilde{B}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{\frac{3}{8}}$, $C = \frac{\tilde{C}}{\sqrt{3}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{-\frac{5}{8}}$, $D = \tilde{D}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})^{\frac{3}{8}}$ we can again get two decoupled equations for $\tilde{C}$. Again the coeffecient of $\sigma^2 a^2 \tilde{C}$ for one equation is $-\frac{7}{4}$ and the coefficient of $\sigma^2 a^2 C$ for the other equation is $\frac{17}{4}$. Hence, we are led to $C = 0$, showing that the two most interesting orderings agree.

Furthermore, this result does *not* depend on the chosen gauge group. For a two-dimensional flat Kähler manifold, the Kähler potential would be just $\phi\bar{\phi}$, the Kähler metric is $g_{\phi\bar{\phi}} = 1$ and the Levi-Cita connections are zero. We will find out that the structure of the supersymmetry constraints are again the same. The reason is that the Kähler metric and the connection only enter the Lagrangian through the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field χ_A and no other terms. So, there is only a change in the coefficient of $\bar{\phi}\chi_A\chi^B\frac{\partial}{\partial\chi^B}$ in S_A and the corresponding term in $\bar{S}_A$, the rest being equivalent to put $\phi\bar{\phi} = 0$ in the necessary coefficients. The supersymmetry constraints are then

$$\begin{aligned} S_A &= -2\sqrt{3} i \chi_A \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} - a \psi_A \frac{\partial}{\partial a} - 6\sigma^2 a^2 \psi_A - \frac{i\sqrt{3}}{2} \bar{\phi} \chi_A \chi^B \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^B} \\ &- \frac{1}{4} \psi_B \psi^B \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi^A} - \frac{i\sqrt{3}}{2} \bar{\phi} \chi_A \psi^B \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi^B} - \frac{5}{2} \chi_A \psi^B \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^B} + \frac{3}{2} \chi^B \psi_B \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^A} + \psi_A \chi^B \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^B} \end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

and $\bar{S}_A$ is the Hermitian conjugate using (122).

Solving the $S_A\Psi = 0$ and $\bar{S}_A\Psi = 0$, we obtain eight equations between B , C and D. Using $B = \tilde{B}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\phi\bar{\phi})$, $C = \frac{\tilde{C}}{\sqrt{3}}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\phi\bar{\phi})$ and $D = \tilde{D}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\phi\bar{\phi})$ [19], we get

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{B}}{\partial\phi} + \frac{a}{12}\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a} - \frac{7}{12}\tilde{C} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2\tilde{C} = 0 \ , \ \frac{\partial\tilde{D}}{\partial\bar{\phi}} - \frac{a}{12}\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial a} + \frac{7}{12}\tilde{C} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 a^2\tilde{C} = 0 \ , \tag{142}$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial\phi} - a\frac{\partial\tilde{D}}{\partial a} - 6\sigma^2 a^2\tilde{D} + 3\tilde{D} = 0 \ , \ \frac{\partial\tilde{C}}{\partial\bar{\phi}} + a\frac{\partial\tilde{B}}{\partial a} - 6\sigma^2 a^2\tilde{B} - 3\tilde{B} = 0 \ . \tag{143}$$

This set of equations are exactly the same as (135), (136) if we put $\phi\bar{\phi} = 0$ in there. We conclude, therefore, that for the two-dimensional flat Kähler manifold, $\tilde{C} = 0$. These results seem to suggest that whatever Kähler manifold one uses, we reach the same conclusion.

Let us now address the interpretation of the solutions we found above.

A Hartle-Hawking (or no-boundary proposal) [70] solution can be expressed in terms of a Euclidian path integral. A three-surface constitutes the *only* boundary of a compact four-manifold, on which the four-metric is $g_{\mu\nu}$ and induces h^0_{ij} on the boundary, and the matter field is ϕ and matches ϕ_0 on the boundary as well. A path integral is performed over all such $g_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ within all such manifolds. For manifolds of the form of $\mathbf{R}\times\Sigma$, the no-boundary proposal indicates us to choose initial conditions at the initial point as to ensure the closure of four geometry. It basically consists in setting the initial three-surface volume $h^{1/2}$ to zero.

Wormholes classical solutions connect different asymptotic regions of a Riemannian geometry. Such solutions can only be found when certain types of matter fields are present However, it seems more natural to study quantum wormhole states, i.e., solutions of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. [71]. The wormhole ground state may be defined by a path integral over all possible asymptotic Euclidian 4-geometries and matter fields whose energy-momentum tensor vanishes at infinity.

It is tempting to identify a Hartle-Hawking wave function in the fermionic filled sector, say, with $g(\phi)\exp(3\sigma^2 a^2)$. However, notice that the equations obtained from $S_A\Psi = 0, \bar{S}_A\Psi = 0$ are *not enough* to specify $g(\phi)$. This is particularly disappointing. A similar situation is also present in ref. [19], although an extra multiplicative factor of a^5 multiplying $g(\phi)$ induces an *even less* clear situation. In fact, no attempt was made in ref. [18, 19] to obtain a Hartle-Hawking solution. Being $N = 1$ supergravity a square root of general relativity [2], we would expect to be able to find solutions of the type $e^{ik\phi}e^{a^2}$. These would correspond to the Hartle-hawking state of a FRW model with a massless minimally coupled scalar field in ordinary quantum cosmology [66, 70].

In principle, there are no physical arguments for wormhole states to be absent in N=1 supergravity with supermatter. In ordinary FRW quantum cosmology with scalar fields, the wormhole (ground) state solution would have a form like $e^{-a^2\cosh(\rho)}$ [18, 19, 100, 101], with $\phi = \rho\times exp(i\theta)$. However, such behaviour is not provided in eq. (134), (139). Actually, it seems quite different. It is very puzzling that the wormhole state could be absent. However, ref. [19] clearly represents an opposite point of view, as it explicitly depicts wormhole (Hawking-Page) [71] states in a locally supersymmetric scenario.

We may then ask in which conditions can solutions (134), (139) be accomodated in order for Hartle-Hawking or wormhole type solutions to be obtained. The arbitrary functions f, g, h, k do not allow to conclude unequivovally that they would be damped either at small or large 3-geometries, for allowed values of $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ on the boundary or at infinity. Claims were made in ref. [26, 27] that *no* wormhole states were found. Moreover, the claim [26, 27] that a Hartle-Hawking solution was identified is definitively *not* satisfactory [32, 33].

Hence, the current situation is as follows. Hartle-Hawking and quantum wormhole type solutions were found in minisuperspaces for pure N=1 supergravity [9]-[17], [21]-[23]. However, wormhole solutions are absent in the literature [15], concerning pure gravity cases [71, 100, 101]. Hartle-Hawking wave functions and wormhole ground states are present in ordinary minisuperspace with matter [66, 70, 71, 100, 101]. When supersymmetry is introduced [16]-[20], [27]-[34] we confront problems as far as Hartle-Hawking or wormhole type solutions are concerned.

Let us address the apparent absence of wormhole solutions in (134), (139). As mentioned above, wormhole solutions were found[16] in ref. [19] for supersymmetric FRW models with scalar supermultiplets. But it should be emphasized that in [19] the re-definition (79), (80) for fermionic non-dynamical variables was employed, together with a fermionic ordering satisfying criteria **1, 2, 4.** The relevant equations in ref. [19] are

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}+6a^2-5\right)A &= 0\ ,\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}-9\bar{\phi}\right)A=0\ , && (144)\\
\left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}+6a^2\right)C-2\frac{\partial B}{\partial \phi} &= 0\ ,\ \ 2\left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}+6a^2-2\right)D-\frac{\partial C}{\partial \phi}=0\ , && (145)\\
2\left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}-6a^2-2\right)iB-\frac{\partial C}{\partial \bar{\phi}} &= 0\ ,\ \ \left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}-6a^2\right)C-2\frac{\partial D}{\partial \bar{\phi}}=0 && (146)\\
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\phi}}-9\phi\right)E &= 0\ ,\left(a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}-6a^2-5\right)E=0\ . && (147)
\end{aligned}$$

The four Dirac-like equations (145), (146) for the components B, C, D lead consistently to a set of Wheeler–DeWitt equations for each bosonic amplitude. E.g.,

$$a\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\left(a\frac{\partial C}{\partial a}\right)-2a\frac{\partial C}{\partial a}-36a^4C-\frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial\phi\partial\bar{\phi}}=0\ . \tag{148}$$

A wormhole state may then be obtained (cf. ref. [19])

$$C(a,\rho)=a\int_0^\infty dk\ k\ g(k)H^{(1)}_{\nu(k)}\left(3ia^2\right)J_0(k\rho)\ ,g(k)=\exp\left[\frac{1}{2}i\pi\nu(k)\right]\ , \tag{149}$$

where $H^{(1)}_{\nu(k)}$ and $J_0(k\rho)$ are Hankel and Bessel functions, respectively.

The explanation for the apparent opposite conclusions in [19, 27] is that the choice of Lagrange multipliers and fermionic derivative ordering can make a difference. Our arguments are as follows.

Let us first consider the choice of Lagrange multipliers and their possible influence. The quantum formulation of wormholes in ordinary quantum cosmology has been shown to depend on the lapse function [100, 101]. A similar ambiguity has already been pointed out in [102] (see also [103]) but for generic quantum cosmology and related to bosonic factor ordering questions in the Wheeler-DeWitt operator. The self-adjointness in the Wheeler-DeWitt operator involves a non-linearity in N. For each choice of N there is a different metric in minisuperspace, all these metrics being related by a conformal transformation [104]. Therefore, for each of these choices, the quantization process will be different[17].

---

[15] Notice that for pure gravity neither classical or quantum wormhole solutions have been produced in the literature. A matter field seems to be required: the "throat" size is proportional to $\sqrt{\mathcal{J}}$ where $\mathcal{J}$ represents a (conserved) flux of matter fields.

[16] Notice that an attempt [18] using the constraints present in [16, 17] but the ordering employed in **1. - 3.** also seemed to have failed in getting wormhole states.

[17] In fact, consider a minisuperspace consisting of a FRW geometry and homogeneous scalar field. A conformal coupling allows a more general class of solutions of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation than does the minimally coupled case, even if a one-to-one correspondence exists between bounded states [104].

For some choices of N the quantization are even *inadmissible*, e.g, when $N \to 0$ too fast for vanishing 3-geometries in the wormhole case (cf. ref. [100, 101] for more details). Basically, requiring regularity for Ψ at $a \to 0$ is equivalent to self-adjointness for the Wheeler-DeWitt operator at that point. Choices of N that vanish too fast when $a \to 0$ will lead to problems as the minisuperspace measure will be infinite at (regular) configurations associated with vanishing three-geometries volume.

A similar effect can be expected when local supersymmetry transformations are present[18]. Besides the lapse function, we have now the time components of the gravitino field, ψ_0^A, and of the torsion-free connection ω_{AB}^0 as Lagrange multipliers. At the pure N=1 supergravity level, the re-definition of fermionic non-dynamical variables (79), (80) changes the supersymmetry and Hamiltonian constraints. In fact, *no* fermionic terms were present in $\mathcal{H} \sim \{S_A, \bar{S}_A\}$ and *no* cubic fermionic terms in the supersymmetry constraints. Hence, *no* ordering problems with regard to fermionic derivatives were present. The model with matter used in [19] was then extracted *post-hoc* [17, 20] from a few basic assumptions about their general form and supersymmetric algebra. Cubic fermionic terms like $\psi\bar{\psi}\psi$ or $\psi\bar{\chi}\chi$ are now present but the former is absent in the pure case.

Let us be more clear. If we just use ψ_0^A, then the supersymmetry and Hamiltonian constraints read (in the pure case):

$$S_A = \psi_A \pi_a - 6ia\psi_A + \frac{i}{2a} n_A^{\ E'} \psi^E \psi_E \overline{\psi}_{E'}, \tag{150}$$

$$\overline{S}_{A'} = \overline{\psi}_{A'} \pi_a + 6ia\overline{\psi}_{A'} - \frac{i}{2a} n_E^{\ A'} \overline{\psi}^{E'} \psi_E \overline{\psi}_{E'}, \tag{151}$$

$$\mathcal{H} = -a^{-1}(\pi_a^2 + 36a^2) + 12a^{-1} n^{AA'} \psi_A \overline{\psi}_{A'}. \tag{152}$$

Comparing with (81), we see that the redefinition (79), (80) imply the the last term in eq. (150), (151), (152) to be absent. For $\Psi \sim A_1 + A_2\psi_A\psi^A$, $A_1 = e^{-3a^2}$ and $A_2 = e^{3a^2}$ constitute solutions of the equations induced by $S_A\Psi = 0$ and $\bar{S}_A\Psi = 0$, respectively. This holds for the pure case if we use either Ψ_0^A or ρ^A. This particular Ψ is also a solution of $\mathcal{H}\Psi = 0$, *but only* for the $\mathcal{H}$ without the second term in (152). I.e., when (79), (80) are fully employed. In fact, Ψ does not constitute a solution of the full expression in (152): the function e^{3a^2} would have to be replaced.

Hence the choice between ρ_A and ψ_0^A directly affects any consistency between the quantum solutions of the supersymmetry constraints.

Criteria **1,2,4** (ref. [17, 18, 20]) for the fermionic derivative ordering were used in solving the equations above. In ref. [19] an Hermitian adjoint relation between the supersymmetry transformations (criteria **3.**) was accomodated. In ref. [27] all these criteria were tested but with the supersymmetry and Hamiltonian constraints directly obtained from $\psi_0^A, \bar{\psi}_0^{A'}, N$. Fermionic factor ordering becomes absent for (79), (80). If we then use the fermionic ordering employed in [18] (where we accomodate the Hermitain adjointness with requirements **1,2,4** up to minor changes relatively to **1,2**) a wormhole state can be found (cf. ref. [19]).

Thus, there seems to be a relation between a choice of Lagrange multipliers (which simplifies the constraints and the algebra in the pure case) and fermionic factor ordering (which may become absent in the pure case). These in turn enable to obtain second order consistent equations (i.e., Wheeler-DeWitt type) or solutions from the supersymmetry constraints. The consistency failure found from (137), (138), e.g., is the reason why $C = 0$. Different choices of ψ_0^A or ρ_A, then of fermionic derivative ordering will lead to different supersymmetry constraints and to different solutions for the quantization of the problem.

---

[18] It should be recalled that a combination of two supersymmetry transformations, generated by S_A and $\bar{S}_{A'}$ and whose amount is represented by the Lagrange multipliers $\psi_0^A, \bar{\psi}_0^{A'}$, can be equivalent to a transformation generated by the Hamiltonian constraint and where the lapse function is the corresponding Lagrange multiplier.

Finally, let us write the first-order differential equations derived from the supersymmetry constraints (i.e., eq. (132), (133), (135), (136)) but with $\phi = re^{i\theta}$ and $C = 0$. This will assist us in getting the explicit dependence of Ψ on $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ and adequately identify the Hartle-Hawking wave-function. We then get

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial r} - i\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial A}{\partial \theta} = 0 \ , \ \frac{\partial E}{\partial r} + i\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial E}{\partial \theta} = 0 \ , \tag{153}$$

$$(1+r^2)\frac{\partial B}{\partial r} - i\frac{1+r^2}{r}\frac{\partial B}{\partial \theta} + rB = 0 \ , (1+r^2)\frac{\partial D}{\partial r} + i\frac{1+r^2}{r}\frac{\partial D}{\partial \theta} + rD = 0 \ , \tag{154}$$

which provide (after integration) the general quantum state

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= c_1 r^{\lambda_1} e^{-i\lambda_1\theta} e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2} + c_3 a^3 r^{\lambda_3} e^{-i\lambda_3\theta}(1+r^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{3\sigma^2 a^2}\psi^C\psi_C \\ &+ c_4 a^3 r^{\lambda_4} e^{i\lambda_4\theta}(1+r^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2}\chi^C\chi_C + c_2 r^{\lambda_2} e^{i\lambda_2\theta} e^{3\sigma^2 a^2}\psi^C\psi_C\chi^D\chi_D \ , \end{aligned} \tag{155}$$

where $\lambda_1 ... \lambda_4$ and $c_1 ... c_4$ are constants. Notice now the explicit form of A, B, D, E in (155) in contrast with previous expressions. If we had use $\phi = \phi_1 + i\phi_2$ then the corresponding first-order differential equations would lead to $A = d_1 e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2} e^{k_1(\phi - i\phi_2)}$, $B = d_3 e^{3\sigma^2 a^2}(1 + \phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2) e^{k_3(\phi - i\phi_2)}$, $B = d_4 e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2}(1 + \phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2) e^{k_4(\phi + i\phi_2)}$, $E = d_2 e^{3\sigma^2 a^2} e^{k_2(\phi + i\phi_2)}$.

The bosonic coefficients in (155) correspond to particular solutions obtainable within the framework of ref. [114] *if* a specific factor ordering for π_a, π_r, π_θ is used in the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. The point is that the supersymmetry constraints imply $\frac{\partial A}{\partial \bar{\phi}} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial E}{\partial \phi} = 0$ and the Wheeler-DeWitt equation involves a term $\pi_\phi \pi_{\bar{\phi}} \sim (\pi_r - i\pi_\theta)(\pi_r + i\pi_\theta) \mapsto \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2}$. But $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} - i\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + i\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta}\right) \neq \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2}$. Hence, the presence of supersymmetry *selects* a particular factor ordering for the canonical momenta in the Hamiltonian constraint. As a consequence, specific exact solutions[19] (say, $e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2} r^\lambda e^{i\lambda\theta}$) can be found from the Wheeler-DeWitt equation in the gravitational and matter sectors. The no-boundary wave function corresponds to the bosonic coefficient A.

Notice that the bosonic coefficients in (155) satisfy attractive relations in a 3-dimensional minisuperspace (see ref. [39, 40] for a comprehensive description)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(A \cdot E)}{\partial a} + \frac{\partial(A \cdot E)}{\partial \theta} - ir\left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial r}A - \frac{\partial A}{\partial r}E\right) &= 0, \quad (156) \\ D_a(B \cdot D) + \frac{\partial(B \cdot D)}{\partial \theta} - ir\left(\frac{\partial B}{\partial r}D - \frac{\partial D}{\partial r}B\right) &= 0 \ , \quad (157) \end{aligned}$$

with $D_a = \partial_a - 6/a$. However, the presence of the last term in both eq. (156) and (157) clearly prevent us from to associate them with a conservation equation of the type $\nabla J = 0$. It is explained in ref. [39, 40] how the presence of supersymmetry, θ no longer being a cyclical coordinate and the absence of satisfactory conserved currents are all related.

---

[19] In the decomposition $\phi = \phi_1 + i\phi_2$ the bosonic part of the Hamiltonian constraint corresponds to a FRW model with two independent massless scalar fields. The novel characteristic induced by supersymmetry is that the complex scalar fields imply via the expressions for A or E that the (separation) constant k (present in the equations equivalent to eqs. (9)-(23) of ref. [71]) is now $k = d_1^2 - d_1^2 = 0$. This means that the scalar flux associated with ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 as described in [71] is now absent. Consequently, the lower bound for a is $a = 0$. It is then not apparent how these solutions can represent a wormhole connecting two asymptotic regions.

3.3.3 FRW model with generic gauged matter

Let us now solve the supersymmetry constraints $S_A\Psi = 0$ and $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ for the more general case where all supermatter fields are present. We will use the ansätze described in subsections 3.1.2 and 3.3.1. The number of constraint equations will be very high. Their full analysis is quite tedious and to write all the terms would overburden the reader. Let us instead show some examples of the calculations involving the $S_A\Psi = 0$ constraint (see ref. [28, 29]).

Consider the terms linear in χ_A: $\left[-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\frac{\partial A}{\partial \phi}\right]\chi_A + \frac{\sigma^2 a^2 gf}{\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\sigma^a{}_{AA'}n^{BA'}\bar{X}^{(a)}A\chi_B = 0$. Since this is true for all χ_A, the above equation becomes

$$\left[-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\frac{\partial A}{\partial \phi}\right]\epsilon_A{}^B + \frac{\sigma^2 a^2 gf}{\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\sigma^a{}_{AA'}n^{BA'}\bar{X}^{(a)} = 0. \tag{158}$$

Multiply the whole equation by $n_{BB'}$ and use the relation $n_{BB'}n^{BA'} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{B'}^{A'}$. We can see that the two terms in (158) are independent of each other since the σ matrices are orthogonal to the n matrix. Thus, we conclude that $A = 0$.

Now consider, e.g., the terms linear in $\chi_B\psi^C\psi_C$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\left[(1+\phi\bar{\phi})\frac{\partial B}{\partial \phi}\right. &+ \left.\frac{1}{2}\bar{\phi}B + i\frac{a}{4\sqrt{3}}\frac{\partial C}{\partial a} - i\frac{7}{4\sqrt{3}}C + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\sigma^2 a^2 C\right]\chi_A\psi^C\psi_C \\ &+ i\frac{\sigma^2 a^2 gf}{\sqrt{2}(1+\phi\bar{\phi})}\sigma^a{}_{AA'}n^{BA'}\bar{X}^{(a)}B\chi_B\psi^C\psi_C = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{159}$$

By the same argument as above, the first term is independent of the second one and we have the result $B = 0$.

As we proceed, this pattern keeps repeating itself. Some equations show that the coefficients have some symmetry properties. For example, let us take $d_{(ab)} = 2g_{(ab)}$. But when these two terms are combined with each other, they become zero. This can be seen as follows,

$$d_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\chi_C\bar{\lambda}^{(a)D}\chi_D + g_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\chi^D\psi_D = -g_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\chi^D\psi_D + g_{ab}\bar{\lambda}^{(a)C}\bar{\lambda}^{(b)}_C\chi^D\psi_D, \tag{160}$$

using the property that $g_{ab} = g_{ba}$ and the spinor identity $\theta_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}\theta_C{}^C\epsilon_{AB}$ where θ_{AB} is anti-symmetric in the two indices. The same property applies to the terms with coefficients f_{abcd} and g_{abcd}. Other equations imply that the coefficients $c_{abc}, d_{abc}, c_{abcd}, e_{abc}, f_{abc}, d_{abcd}$, e_{abcd}, h_{abcd} are totally symmetric in their indices. This then leads to terms cancelling each other, as can easily be shown. In the end, considering both the $S_A\Psi = 0$ and $\bar{S}_A\Psi = 0$ constraints, we are left with the surprising result that the wave function (130) must be zero in order to satisfy the quantum constraints!

3.3.4 FRW model with Yang-Mills fields

We will now consider a FRW model with Yang Mills fields obtained from the more general theory of N=1 supergravity with gauged supermatter [34], associated with a gauge group $\hat{G} = SU(2)$. We will put all scalar fields and corresponding supersymmetric partners equal to zero[20]. It should be noticed that Yang-Mills fields coupled to N=1 supergravity can also be found in ref. [105]. We shall use the ansatz (107) for $A^{(a)}_\mu$. This implies $A^{(a)}_\mu$ to be paramatrized by a single effective scalar function $f(t)$. Ordinary FRW cosmologies with this Yang-Mills field ansatz are totally equivalent to a FRW minisuperspace with an effective conformally coupled scalar field, but with a quartic potential instead of a quadratic one [88, 89], [95]-[98].

---

[20] It was shown in ref. [95, 97] for the case of a gauge group SO(3) ∼ SU(2) that invariance for homogeneity and isotropy as well as gauge transformations require all components of ϕ to be zero. Only for SO(N), N>3 we can have ϕ = (0,0,0, $\phi_1, ..., \phi_{N-3}$).

The introduction of fermions in ordinary quantum cosmological models with gauge fields led to additional *non-trivial* ansätze for the fermionic fields [106]. These involve restrictions from group theory, rather than just imposing time dependence. However, we should notice that fermions in simple minisuperspace models have also been considered in [91, 107, 108]. Some questions concerning the (in)consistency of these models were raised in [107] and an attempt to clarify them was made in [108].

Hence, it seemed sensible that similarly to the case where only scalar fields are present, we ought to take as fermionic partner for (107) a simple spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ field, like χ_A. However, this would lead to some difficulties (see ref. [34] for more details). The more general ansatz for the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fields is just to take

$$\lambda_A^{(a)} = \lambda_A^{(a)}(t) \ , \tag{161}$$

and correspondingly to its Hermitian conjugate

An important consequence of not having scalar fields and their fermionic partners is that the Killing potentials $D^{(a)}$ and related quantitites are now absent. In fact, if we had complex scalar fields, a Kähler manifold could be considered with metric g_{IJ^*} on the space of (ϕ^I, ϕ^{J^*}). For $\hat{G} = SU(2)$ with $\phi = \bar{\phi} = 0$ this implies $D^{(1)} = D^{(2)} = 0$ and $D^{(3)} = -\frac{1}{2}$. However, being the $D^{(a)}$ fixed up to constants which are now arbitrarly, we can choose $D^{(3)} = 0$ consistently.

The subsequent steps correspond to adapt subsection 3.3.1 according to the ansätze mentioned above. Namely, truncatingeq. (128), its H.c. and (130). Ref. [34] can be consulted for further details.

From $S_A\Psi = 0$ we obtain

$$-\frac{a}{2\sqrt{6}}\frac{\partial A}{\partial a} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\sigma^2 a^2 A = 0, \tag{162}$$

$$-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\frac{\partial A}{\partial f} + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}[1-(f-1)^2]\sigma^2 \ A = 0, \tag{163}$$

They correspond, respectively, to terms linear in ψ_A and $\bar{\lambda}_A^{(a)}$. Eq. (162), (163) give the dependence of A on a and f, respectively.

Solving these equations leads to $A = \hat{A}(a)\tilde{A}(f)$ as

$$A = e^{-3\sigma^2 a^2} e^{\frac{3}{16}\sigma^2\left(-\frac{f^3}{3}+f^2\right)}, \tag{164}$$

A similar relation exists for the $\bar{S}_A\Psi = 0$ equations, which from the $\psi_A\lambda_E^{(1)}\lambda^E(1)\lambda_E^{(2)}\lambda^E(2)\lambda_E^{(3)}\lambda^E(3)$ term give for $G = \hat{G}(a)\tilde{G}(f)$

$$G = e^{3\sigma^2 a^2} e^{\frac{3}{16}\sigma^2\left(\frac{f^3}{3}-f^2\right)}. \tag{165}$$

It should be emphasized that we are indeed allowed to completely determine the dependence of A and G with respect to a and f, differently to the case of ref. [18, 19, 27, 30]-[33].

The solution (165) corresponds to the Hartle-Hawking (no-boundary) solution [70, 88]. In fact, we basically recover solution (3.8a) of ref. [88] (where only ordinary quantum cosmology with Yang-Mills fields is considered) if we replace $f \to f + 1$. As it can be checked, this constitutes the rightful procedure according to the definitions employed in [95] for $A_\mu^{(a)}$. Solution (165) is also associated with an anti-self-dual solution of the Euclidianized equations of motion (cf. ref. [88, 89]). It is curious that when fermions are present not all the solutions present in [88] can be recovered. This applies to other anti-self-dual and self-dual solutions. Moreover, this implies that the Gaussian wave function (165), peaked around $f = 1$ represents only one of the components of the Hartle-Hawking wave function in [88]. We should notice, however, that the Gaussian wave function in [88] is peaked around the two minima of the potential due to the quadratic nature of this one. In our case, we have instead a Dirac-like structure for our equations and our potential terms correspond rather to a square-root of the potential present in ref. [88]. In their present form, the Dirac bracket of the supersymmetry constraints induces a Hamiltonian whose bosonic part contains the *decoupled* gravitational and vector field parts, in agreement with [88, 98].

Solution (164) could be interpreted as wormhole solution [71, 89], which has not yet been found in ordinary quantum cosmology. However, in spite of (164) being regular for $a \to 0$ and damped for $a \to \infty$, it may not be well behaved when $f \to -\infty$. This last property might constitute a drawback when attempting to identify it as a sucessfullquantum wormhole state [71, 89, 100, 101].

The remaining equations from $\bar{S}_A \Psi = 0$ and Hermitian conjugate imply that any possible solutions are neither the Hartle-Hawking or a wormhole state. In fact, we would get, say, $F \sim a^5 \hat{F}(a) \tilde{F}(f)$ and similar expressions for other coefficients, with a prefactor a^n, $n \neq 0$. Hence, from their a-dependence equations these solutions cannot be either a Hartle-Hawking or wormhole state (cf. ref. [70, 71, 88, 89, 100, 101]).

3.3.5 Bianchi type-IX model with scalar supermultiplets

In this section we will describe a Bianchi type-IX model with spatial metric in diagonal form, using the supersymmetry constraints (46) derived in subsection 2.1.2. We restrict our case to a supermatter model constituted only by a scalar field and its spin$-\frac{1}{2}$ partner with a two-dimensional flat Kähler geometry. The scalar super-multiplet is chosen to be spatially homogeneous. We require that the components ${\psi^A}_0, {\bar{\psi}^{A'}}_0$ be functions of time only. We further require that ${\psi^A}_i$ and ${\bar{\psi}^{A'}}_i$ be spatially homogeneous in the basis ${e^a}_i$ in (2).

A quantum description can be made by studying wave functions of the form $\Psi\left[e^{AA'}_{\ \ i}, {\psi^A}_i, \bar{\chi}_A, \phi, \bar{\phi}\right]$. The choice of $\bar{\chi}_A \equiv {n_A}^{A'} \bar{\chi}_{A'}$ rather than χ_A is designed so that the quantum constraint $\bar{S}_{A'}$ should be of first order in momenta. The momenta are represented[21] by

$$
\begin{aligned}
{p_{AA'}}^i &\to -i\hbar \frac{\delta}{\delta {e^{AA'}}_i} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{ijk} \psi_{Aj} \bar{\psi}_{A'k} && (166)\\
\pi_\phi &\to -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}\ , \pi_{\bar{\phi}} \to -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\phi}}\ , && (167)\\
{\bar{\psi}^{A'}}_i &\to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i\hbar {D^{AA'}}_{ji} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial {\psi^A}_j}\ , \chi^A \to -\sqrt{2}\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^A}\ . && (168)
\end{aligned}
$$

The supersymmetry constraints become, with $\frac{\delta}{\delta e^{CC'j}} = -2 e_{CC'i} \frac{\delta}{\delta h_{ij}}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{S}_{A'} &= -i\sqrt{2}\left[-i\hbar \frac{1}{4}\left[e_{AA'i}\psi^A_j\right] e^{CC'i} \frac{\delta}{\delta e^{CC'j}} - i\hbar \frac{1}{4}\left[e_{AA'i}\psi^A_j\right] e^{CC'j} \frac{\delta}{\delta e^{CC'i}}\right]\\
&+ \sqrt{2}\epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'i}\ {}^{3(s)}{\omega^A}_{Bj} {\psi^B}_j - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \hbar n_{CA'} \bar{\chi}^C \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\phi}}\\
&- i\sqrt{2}\hbar h e^{K/2} P(\phi) {n^A}_{A'} {e^i}_{AB'} {D^{CB'}}_{ji} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi^C_j} - i\sqrt{2}\hbar h e^{K/2} D_\phi P\ {n^A}_{A'} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^A}
\end{aligned}
$$

---

[21] It is interesting to notice that for the $\chi, \bar{\chi}$ fields no powers of h seemed to be needed to establish the equations for the coefficients in Ψ.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \hbar \phi n^{BB'} n_{CB'} \bar{\chi}^{C} n_{DA'} \bar{\chi}^{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^{B}} - \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} \hbar h^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi \epsilon^{ijk} e^{BB'}{}_{j} \psi_{kB} D^{C}{}_{B'li} n_{DA'} \bar{\chi}^{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_{l}^{C}} \\
&- \hbar \sqrt{2} h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{B}{}_{B'}{}^{m} n^{CB'} \psi_{mC} n_{DA'} \bar{\chi}^{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^{B}} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \hbar \epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'j} \psi_{i}^{A} n_{DB'} \bar{\chi}^{D} e^{BB'}{}_{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^{B}} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \hbar h^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi_{iA} (e^{B}{}_{A'}{}^{i} n^{AC'} - e^{AC'i} n^{B}{}_{A'}) n_{DC'} \bar{\chi}^{D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^{B}}, \qquad (169)
\end{aligned}
$$

and S_A is the Hermitian conjugate, where the terms containing no matter fields are consistent with ref. [4]. Notice that a constant analytical potential is similar to the cosmological constant term in ref. [21, 22, 23]. We will employ the integrated form of the constraints, i.e., $\mathcal{H} \equiv \int d^3x H$.

Our general Lorentz-invariant wave function is then taken to be a polynomial of eight degree in Grassmann variables

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi(a_1, a_2, a_3, \phi, \overline{\phi}) &= A + B_1 \beta_A \beta^A + B_2 \overline{\chi}_A \overline{\chi}^A + C_1 \gamma_{ABC} \gamma^{ABC} \\
&+ D_1 \beta_A \beta^A \gamma_{EBC} \gamma^{EBC} + D_2 \overline{\chi}_A \overline{\chi}^A \gamma_{EBC} \gamma^{EBC} \\
&+ F_1 (\beta_A \beta^A \gamma_{EBC} \gamma^{EBC})^2 + F_2 \overline{\chi}_A \overline{\chi}^A (\gamma_{EBC} \gamma^{EBC})^2 \\
&+ G_1 \beta_A \beta^A \overline{\chi}_B \overline{\chi}^B + H_1 \beta_A \beta^A \overline{\chi}_B \overline{\chi}^B \gamma_{EDC} \gamma^{EDC} \\
&+ E_1 (\gamma_{ABC} \gamma^{ABC})^2 + I_1 \beta_A \beta^A \overline{\chi}_B \overline{\chi}^B (\gamma_{EDC} \gamma^{EDC})^2 \\
&+ Z_1 \overline{\chi}_A \beta^A + Z_2 \overline{\chi}_A \beta^A \gamma_{EDC} \gamma^{EDC} + Z_3 \overline{\chi}_A \beta^A (\gamma_{EDC} \gamma^{EDC})^2 \ . \qquad (170)
\end{aligned}
$$

We are aware of its limitations as far as the middle sectors are concerned. In fact, we will be neglecting Lorentz invariants built with gravitational degrees of freedom. The "new" method proposed in [13, 14] to construct the correct middle fermionic sectors would give the correct spectrum of solutions. However, the solutions pointed there were *not* entirely new: they were already present in the "old" framework of [10, 11, 12]. Thus, our simpler Lorentz invariant construction could still be of some utility, namely in obtaining new *realistic* solutions.

The action of the constraints operators $S_A, \bar{S}_{A'}$ on Ψ leads to a system of coupled first order differential equations which the bosonic amplitude coefficients of Ψ must satisfy. These coefficients are functions of $a_1, a_2, a_3, \phi, \bar{\phi}$. The equations are obtained after eliminating the $e_i^{AA'}$ and $n^{AA'}$ resulting in the $S_A \Psi = 0, \bar{S}_{A'} \Psi = 0$. We contract them with combinations of $e_j^{BB'}$ and $n^{CC'}$, followed by integraton over S^3. These equations correspond essentially to expressions in front of terms such as $\bar{\chi}, \beta, \gamma, \beta^A \bar{\chi} \bar{\chi}, \gamma^{ABC} \bar{\chi} \bar{\chi}$, etc, after the fermionic derivatives in $S_A, \bar{S}_{A'}$ have been performed.

As one can easily see, the number of obtained equations will be very large. Actually, its number will be 44×3, taking into account cyclic permutations on a_1, a_2, a_3. Their full analysis is quite tedious. We will instead point here some steps involved in the calculations, and the interested reader is invited to follow ref. [31] for more details. The supersymmetry constraint $\bar{S}_{A'}$ has fermionic terms of the type β^A, γ^{ABC}, $\bar{\chi}^A$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_i^A}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^A}$, $\bar{\chi} \bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}}$, $\psi \bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi}$, $\psi \bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}}$, while S_A is of second order in fermionic derivatives and includes terms as $\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_i^A}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}^A}, \beta^A, \gamma^{ABC}, \bar{\chi}^A, \bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}}, \psi \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi}, \bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi}$. Some of these fermionic terms applied to Ψ increase the fermionic order by a factor of one (e.g, $\bar{\chi}$), while others as $\bar{\chi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\chi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi}$ decrease it by the same amount.

In the following we will describe two cases separately: when the analytic potential $P(\Phi)$ is arbitrarly and when is identically set to zero. We will begin by the former.

It is worthwhile to stress the following result, which holds regardless we put $P(\phi) = 0$ or not (cf. ref. [31] and references therein). Using the symmetry properties of $e_i^{AA'}, n_{AA'}, \gamma^{ABC}, \varepsilon_{AB}$ we can check that all equations which correspond to the terms $\gamma, \gamma\beta\beta, \bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}\gamma, \gamma\gamma\gamma$, $\gamma\beta\beta\gamma\gamma$, $\gamma\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}\gamma\gamma$, $\gamma\beta\beta\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}$, $\gamma\beta\beta\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}\gamma\gamma$ in $S_A \Psi = 0, \bar{S}_{A'} \Psi = 0$ will give a similar expression for the the coefficients A, B_1, B_2, C_1, D_1, D_2, E_1, F_1, F_2, G_1, H_1, I_1. Namely,

$$
P(a_1, a_2, a_3; \phi, \bar{\phi}) e^{\pm\left(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right)}. \qquad (171)
$$

The same does not apply to the Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 coefficients as the $\beta\bar{\chi}\gamma$ and $\beta\bar{\chi}\gamma(\gamma\gamma)$ terms from both the supersymmetry constraints just mix them with other coefficients in Ψ. This can be seen, e.g., from the equations corresponding to $\gamma_{DEF}(\beta\beta)$ term in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$:

$$2\epsilon^{ijk} e_{AA'i} \omega^{A}{}_{Bj} n^{D}{}_{B'} e^{CB'}{}_{k} B_1 - \hbar n^{D}{}_{B'} e^{CB'}{}_{i} \frac{\delta B_1}{\delta e^{BA'}{}_{i}} + (BCD \to CDB) + (BCD \to DBC) = 0 \ . \quad (172)$$

Consider now the equations obtained from $S_A\Psi = 0$ with terms linear in β and γ. After contraction with expressions in $e_i^{AA'}, n_{AA'}$ and integrating over S^3, we get $C_1 = 0$. From the linear terms in β and γ from $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ we get a relation between Z_1 and $B_1 \simeq Y$ (see [31]):

$$Y(a_1 a_2 a_3; \phi, \bar{\phi}) e^{\left[\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\ \left(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right)\right]} + 2\bar{\phi} Z_1 - 8i \frac{\partial Z_1}{\partial \phi} = 0. \quad (173)$$

For the particular case of $B_1 = 0$, i.e., $Y = 0$, it follows from the remaining equations that the only possible solution is $\Psi = 0$. For an arbitrarly B_1, eq. (173) allows to write an expression for Z_1 in terms of functions of $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ and a_1, a_2, a_3. If we use that expression in other equations, we get other formulas for other bosonic coefficients. From this procedure, we would get the general solution of this extremely complicated set of differential equations. Although apparently possible, we could not establish a definite result in the end due to the complexity of the equations involved. As in [17, 20], no easy way is apparent of obtaining an analitycal solution to this set of equations. Moreover, the exponential terms $e^{K/2}$ lead to some difficulties.

Let us now consider the case when we choose the analytical potential to be identically zero. From the equations directly obtained from $S_A\Psi = 0, \bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ we have self-contained groups of equations relating the 15 wave function coefficients. This applies to 3 groups involving (A, B_1, B_2, C_1, Z_1), $(G_1, D_1, D_2, E_1, Z_2)$ and $(H_1, F_1, F_2, I_1, Z_3)$. Moreover, the equations corresponding to the terms linear in $\beta, \gamma, \bar{\chi}$ in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ and $\beta\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}(\gamma\gamma)^2, \beta\beta\bar{\chi}(\gamma\gamma)^2$ in $S_A\Psi = 0$ completly determine the coefficients A and I_1. In addition, A and I_1 do not appear in any other equation. We have then

$$A = f(\phi) e^{-\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right]}, \ I_1 = k(\bar{\phi}) e^{-\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right]} e^{-2\pi^2 \phi\bar{\phi}}. \quad (174)$$

The equations involving B_1, B_2, C_1, Z_1 can also be said to be self-contained in the same sense. They involve only these coefficients and no other. Moreover, these coefficients do not occur in any other equations. This can be checked, namely from the equations for the terms linear in $\beta, \bar{\chi}$ in $S_A\Psi = 0$, $\beta\beta\bar{\chi}$ and $\beta\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}$ in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$, $\beta\beta\gamma$ in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$, $\bar{\chi}\gamma\gamma, \beta\gamma\gamma, \gamma\gamma\gamma$ in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$, γ in $S_A\Psi = 0$. The previous ones in $\bar{\chi}\gamma\gamma, \beta\gamma\gamma, \gamma\gamma\gamma, \gamma$ just involve C_1. All the other equations have B_1, B_2, Z_1. However, the $\beta\bar{\chi}\gamma$ equation in $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ mixes B_1, C_1, Z_1. Actually, is the only equation which mixes C_1 with the remaining bosonic coefficients in the corresponding group. The same structure of equations and relations between coefficients also occur, in particular for the subsets involving D_1, D_2, E_1, Z_2 and F_1, F_2, I_1, Z_3.

From the analysis of the groups of equations which includes B_1, B_2, C_1, Z_1 ($\beta\beta\bar{\chi}$, $\beta\bar{\chi}\bar{\chi}$ equations from $\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi = 0$ and β, $\bar{\chi}$ equations from $S_A\Psi = 0$) we get $Z_1 = 0$. Consequently, the equations corresponding to only β and γ involve just B_1 and C_1. These equations are then as the ones in the case of a Bianchi-IX with $\Lambda = 0$ and no supermatter [10, 12]. The only possible solution of these equations with respest to a_1, a_2, a_3 is the trivial one, i.e., $B_1 = C_1 = 0$. The equations corresponding to $\bar{\chi}$ and combinations of it with β or γ would give, with $B_1 = C_1 = Z_1 = 0$, the dependence of B_2 on a_1, a_2, a_3, ϕ. This corresponds to

$$B_2 = h(\bar{\phi}) a_1 a_2 a_3 e^{-\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2\right]} e^{-2\pi^2 \phi\bar{\phi}}. \quad (175)$$

This pattern repeats itself in a similar way when we consider the two groups involving D_1, D_2, E_1, Z_2 and F_1, F_2, Z_3. We get $E_1 = G_1 = H_1 = 0$ from $Z_2 = D_2 = 0$, $Z_2 = D_1 = 0$, and $Z_3 = F_1 = 0$. Hence, besides A and I_1, only B_2 and F_2 will be different from zero. We can then write for the solution of the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= f(\phi)e^{-\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2\right]} + h(\bar{\phi})a_1a_2a_3e^{\left[-a_1^2-a_2^2-a_3^2\right]}e^{-2\pi^2\phi\overline{\phi}}\overline{\chi}_A\overline{\chi}^A \\ &+ g(\phi)a_1a_2a_3e^{\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2\right]}e^{-2\pi^2\phi\overline{\phi}}\beta_A\beta^A(\gamma_{BCD}\gamma^{BCD})^2 \\ &+ k(\bar{\phi})e^{\frac{8\pi^2}{\hbar}\left[a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2\right]}\overline{\chi}_A\overline{\chi}^A\beta_E\beta^E(\gamma_{BCD}\gamma^{BCD})^2. \end{aligned} \tag{176}$$

4 Bianchi class A models from N=2 supergravity

In this section we will address the canonical formulation of Bianchi class A models in $N = 2$ supergravity, summarizing ref. [35, 36]. $N = 2$ supergravity [73, 80, 84] couples a graviton-gravitino pair with other pair constituted by *another* gravitino and a Maxwell field. It contains a manifest $O(2)$ invariance which rotates the two gravitinos into each other. We consider two cases: when the internal symmetry $O(2)$ is either (a) *global* or (b) *local*.

The action for the general theory in case (a) can be written as [73]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = &- \frac{e}{2\kappa^2}R[e^a_\mu, \omega(e^a_\mu, \psi^{(a)}_\nu)] - \frac{e}{2}\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_\mu \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\gamma_5\gamma_\nu D_\rho(\omega)\psi^{(a)}_\sigma \\ &- \frac{e}{4}F^2_{\mu\gamma} + \frac{\kappa}{4\sqrt{2}}\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_\mu[e(F^{\mu\nu} + \hat{F}^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_5(\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{\hat{F}}^{\mu\nu})]\psi^{(b)}_\nu\epsilon^{ab}, \end{aligned} \tag{177}$$

where

$$\hat{F}_{\mu\nu} = \left(\partial_\mu A_\nu - \frac{\kappa}{2\sqrt{2}}\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_\mu\psi^{(b)}_\nu\epsilon^{ab}\right) - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu), \tag{178}$$

and $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$ equals $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\rho\sigma}$. The gravitinos $\psi^{(a)}_\mu$ are here depicted in 4-component representation, $(a) = 1, 2$ are $O(2)$ group indices and A_μ is a Maxwell field. ω is the connection, γ_μ are Dirac matrices and $\gamma_5 = \gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$. Furthermore, $\epsilon^{12} = 1, \epsilon^{21} = -1$.

En route to the canonical quantization of Bianchi class A models, we require the following two steps to be complied. On the one hand, we ought to re-write the action (177) in 2-component spinor notation. We do so using the conventions in [76] (cf. also [4, 73]). On the other hand, we impose a consistent Bianchi anzätse for all fields.

Choosing a symmetric basis, the tetrad components e^a_i are time dependent only, like the spatial components of the gravitino fields $\psi^{A(a)}_i$ and the Maxwell field A_i. We also require the other components to be time dependent only. Notice that as consequence of choosing a symmetric basis we have $F_{\mu\nu} = A_{\nu,\mu} - A_{\mu,\nu} + A_\sigma C^\sigma_{\mu\nu}$, where $C^\sigma_{\mu\nu} = 0$ if one or more indices are equal to zero[22].

The momentum conjugate to the vector field A_i is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^i &= eh^{ij}\,\partial_0 A_j - \frac{e\kappa}{\sqrt{2}}\,\partial_0 A_i\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_{0A'}\bar{\psi}^{(b)iA'} + \psi^{(a)A}_0\psi^{(b)i}{}_A) \\ &+ \frac{ie\kappa}{2\sqrt{2}}\,\partial_0 A_i\,\epsilon^{ijk}\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_{jA'}\bar{\psi}^{(b)A'}_k - \psi^{(a)A}_j\psi^{(b)}_{kA}). \end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

---

[22] This simply means that according to the chosen Bianchi type we can have either a pure electric, magnetic or both fields. See ref.[68] for an early review of Bianchi minisuperspace models in the presence of electromagnetic fields. Pure uniform magnetic or electric fields (but not both) are only allowed for the Bianchi types I, II, III, VI ($h = -1$), VII ($h = 0$) with possible constraints and are forbidden for the types IV, V, VI ($h \neq -1$), VII ($h \neq 0$), VIII, IX. For types IV, V, VI ($h \neq -1$), VII ($h \neq 0$), VIII, IX, however, both electric and magnetic fields are present but they are parallel to each other (null Poyinting vector).

Notice that we do not get any gauge – central charge – constraint term of the form A_0Q. This is due to our specific homogeneous ansätze choices above mentioned and also to the choice of *global* invariance . Had we considered a mininal coupling, i.e., gauging the $O(2)$ transformations [84] then a A_0Q term could be present in the Hamiltonian.

The Dirac bracket relations are now:

$$\left[e_i{}^{AA'}, \hat{p}^j_{BB'}\right]_D = \delta^j_i \delta^A_B \delta^{A'}_{B'}, \ \left[\psi_i^{(a)A}, \bar{\psi}_j^{(b)A'}\right]_D = -\delta^{ab} D^{AA'}{}_{ij}, \ \left[A_i, \pi^j\right]_D = \delta^j_i, \tag{180}$$

where we have defined $\hat{p}^i_{AA'} = p^i_{AA'} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk}\psi^{(a)}_{jA}\bar{\psi}^{(a)}_{kA'}$. The Lorentz constraints are $J_{AB} = p_{i(A}{}^{A'} e^i_{B)A'} + \psi^{(a)}_{i(A}\pi^{(a)i}_{B)}$, and its conjugate. Multiplying the Lorentz constraints by ω_{0AB} and $\bar{\omega}_{0A'B'}$ and adding them in this way to the supersymmetry constraints, the supersymmetry constraints take the form

$$\bar{S}^{(a)}_{A'} = -ip^i_{AA'}\psi_i^{(a)A} + \kappa\epsilon^{ab}\left[\pi^i - ih^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\kappa}{4}\epsilon^{imn}\epsilon^{cd}\psi_m^{(c)B}\psi^{(d)}_{nB} + ih^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{1}{8}F_{jk}\epsilon^{ijk}\right]\bar{\psi}^{(b)}_{iA'} \tag{181}$$

and its Hermitian conjugate.

The promotion of the $O(2)$ internal symmetry to a gauge transformation [73] implies that the following terms (already written in 2-component spinor notation) should be added to the Lagrangian in (177):

$$\begin{aligned} -e\Lambda \quad &- \quad e\sqrt{-\frac{2\Lambda}{3}}\left[\psi_\mu^{A(a)} e^\mu_{AB'} e_B^{B'\nu}\psi_\nu^{B(a)} + \bar{\psi}^{(a)}_{A'\mu} e^{BA'\mu} e^\nu_{BB'}\bar{\psi}_\nu^{B'(a)}\right] \\ &- \quad \frac{1}{2}e\sqrt{-\frac{\Lambda}{6}}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\left[\psi_\mu^{A(a)} e_{\nu AA'} A_\rho \bar{\psi}_\sigma^{A'(b)} - \bar{\psi}^{(a)}_{\mu A'} e_\nu^{AA'} A_\rho \psi^{(b)}_{\sigma A}\right]\epsilon^{ab}, \end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

where the cosmological constant Λ is related to the gauge coupling constant, g by $\Lambda = -6\mathrm{g}^2$. Eq. (182) is a consequence of coupling *minimally* the Maxwell field to the fermions. From local invariance, we now get a gauge – central charge – constraint term A_0Q in the action, which for the case of our Bianchi models takes the form

$$Q = h^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{-\frac{\Lambda}{6}}\epsilon^{ab}\epsilon^{ijk}\psi_i^{(a)A} e_{jAA'}\bar{\psi}_k^{(b)A'}. \tag{183}$$

Furthermore, the $\bar{S}^{(a)}_{A'}$ supersymmetry constraint (181) gets the additional contributions,

$$h^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{-\frac{\Lambda}{6}}\epsilon^{ab}\epsilon^{ijk} e_{iAA'} A_j \psi_k^{(b)A} - h^{\frac{1}{2}}\sqrt{-\frac{2\Lambda}{3}} e^A{}_{A'}{}^i n_{AB'}\bar{\psi}_i^{(a)B'}. \tag{184}$$

Quantum mechanically, the bracket relations become

$$\left[e_i{}^{AA'}, \hat{p}^j_{BB'}\right] = i\hbar\delta^j_i \delta_B{}^A \delta_{B'}{}^{A'}, \ \left\{\psi_i^{(a)A}, \bar{\psi}_j^{(b)A'}\right\} = -i\hbar\delta^{ab} D^{AA'}{}_{ij}, \ \left[A_i, \pi^j\right] = i\hbar\delta^j_i. \tag{185}$$

Choosing $\left(A_i, e_{iAA'}, \psi_i^{(a)A}\right)$ as the coordinates variables in our minisuperspace, we consequently employ

$$\hat{p}^j_{AA'} \to -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial e_j^{AA'}}, \quad \bar{\psi}_j^{(a)A'} \to -i\hbar D^{AA'}{}_{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi_i^{(a)A}}, \quad \pi^i \to -i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i}. \tag{186}$$

After all the simplications, we finally obtain the quantum supersymmetry constraints as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}^{(a)}_{A'} \quad &= \quad -\hbar\psi_i^{(a)A}\frac{\partial}{\partial e_i^{AA'}} - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\epsilon^{ijk}\Gamma^{ab}\psi_i^{(a)A}\psi^{(b)}_{jA} D^B{}_{A'lk}\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi_l^{(b)B}} \\ &+ \quad \hbar\kappa\epsilon^{ab} D^c{}_{A'mi}\left[\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i} - h^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\kappa}{4}\epsilon^{ijk}\epsilon^{cd}\psi_j^{(c)B}\psi^{(d)}_{kB} + \frac{i}{8}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{ijk}F_{jk}\right]\frac{\partial}{\partial\psi_m^{(b)C}}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{187}$$

plus the terms in (184) and $S_A^{(a)}$ is the Hermitian conjugate, where $\Gamma^{12} = \Gamma^{21} = 1$ and the remaining are zero.

We now address the physical states which are solutions of the above constraints. The quantum states may be described by the wave function $\Psi(e_{AA'i}, A_j, \psi_{Ai}^{(a)})$. From the Lorentz constraint, Ψ must be expanded in even powers of $\psi_{Ai}^{(a)}$, symbolically represented by ψ^0, ψ^2 up to ψ^{12}. This is due to the anti-commutation relations of the six spatial components of the *two* types of gravitino.

An important consequence of eq. (187) is that *neither* of the supersymmetry constraints $\bar{S}_{A'}^{(a)}$ and $S_A^{(a)}$ conserves fermion number. In fact, a mixing between fermionic modes occurs for Ψ. This is due to terms involving $\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_m^{(b)C}}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i}\psi_{iA}^{(b)}$ or the ones associated with F_{jk}. While the remaining fermionic terms in $\bar{S}_{A'}^{(a)}$ (187) act on Ψ by increasing the fermionic order by a factor of one, $\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_m^{(b)C}}$ decrease it by the same amount. Concerning the $S_A^{(a)}$ constraint, the situation is precisely the reverse. The nature of this problem can also be better understood as follows.

Let us consider the two fermion level and follow the guidelines described in [14]. Since we have 12 degrees of freedom associated with the gravitinos, we may expect to have up to 66 terms in this fermionic sector. Thus, the two-fermion level of the more general ansatz of the wave function can be written as

$$\Psi_2 = (C_{ijab} + E_{ijab})\, \psi^{(a)iB}\psi^{(b)j}{}_B + (U_{ijkab} + V_{ijkab})\, e^i{}_{AA'} n_B{}^{A'} \psi^{(a)jA}\psi^{(b)kB}, \tag{188}$$

where $C_{ijab} = C_{(ij)(ab)}$, $E_{ijab} = E_{[ij][ab]}$, $U_{ijkab} = U_{i(jk)[ab]}$ and $V_{ijkab} = V_{i[jk](ab)}$. When Ψ is truncated in the second fermionic order, we obtain a set of equations, relating $\frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial a_i}$ with $\frac{\partial C_{ijab}}{\partial A_i}$, $\frac{\partial E_{ijab}}{\partial A_i}$, $\frac{\partial U_{ijkab}}{\partial A_i}$, $\frac{\partial V_{ijkab}}{\partial A_i}$ (from $\bar{S}_{A'}^{(a)}$) and $\frac{\partial C_{ijab}}{\partial a_i}$, $\frac{\partial E_{ijab}}{\partial a_i}$, $\frac{\partial U_{ijkab}}{\partial a_i}$, $\frac{\partial V_{ijkab}}{\partial a_i}$ with $\frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial A_i}$ (from $S_A^{(a)}$). Here $a_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, stand for scale factors in a Bianchi class A model, Ψ_0 denotes the bosonic sector and $\Psi_0, C_{ijab}, E_{ijab}, U_{ijkab}, V_{ijkab}$ are functions of A_j, a_i solely. Moving to the equations corresponding to higher fermionic terms this pattern keeps repeating itself, with algebraic terms added to it.

However, the present situation is rather different from the one in FRW models in $N = 1$ supergravity with supermatter (cf. ref. [27]). In the FRW case, the mixing occurs only within each fermionic level and decoupled from other Lorentz invariant fermionic sectors with different order. In the present case, the mixing is between fermionic sectors of the same and *any* different adjacent order. This situation is quite similar to what a cosmological constant causes.

It is tempting to see the relations between gradient terms such as $\frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial a_i}$ with $\frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial A_i}$ (from $\bar{S}_{A'}^{(a)}$) and $\frac{\partial \Psi_2}{\partial a_i}$ with $\frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial A_i}$ (from $S_A^{(a)}$) as a consequence of $N = 2$ supergravity [73, 80, 84] realizing Einstein's dream of unifying gravity with electromagnetism. These relations establish a duality between the coefficients of Ψ in fermionic sectors of adjacent order relatively to the intertwining of the derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial A_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial a_i}$.

When considering $O(2)$ local invariance a gauge constraint (183) appears. In spite of the additional difficulties caused now by cosmological constant and gravitinos mass-terms, the presence of (183) allows us to extract some information concerning the form of the wave function. Quantum mechanically, the gauge constraint takes the form

$$\hat{Q} \sim \varepsilon^{ab}\psi_m^{(a)A}\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi_m^{(b)A}}. \tag{189}$$

Notice that the gauge constraint has no factor ordering problem due to the presence of ε^{ab}. It is then simple to verify that the following fermionic expressions satisfy the gauge constraint operator above:

$$\hat{Q} S^{mn}\psi_{mA}^{(c)}\psi_n^{(c)A} = 0 \ , \ \hat{Q} T_{i[jk]} e^i_{AA'} n_B{}^{A'} \psi^{(a)jA}\psi^{(a)kB} = 0. \tag{190}$$

where $S^{mn} = S^{(mn)}$. Hence, the most general solution of the quantum gauge constraint can be written as

$$\Psi = \Psi\left[e^i_{AA'}, A_j, S^{mn}\psi^{(c)}_{mA}\psi^{(c)A}_n, T_{i[jk]}e^i_{AA'}n_B{}^{A'}\psi^{(a)jA}\psi^{(a)kB}\right]. \tag{191}$$

However, obtaining non-trivial solutions of the supersymmetry constraints in the metric representation for Bianchi class A models with $\Lambda \neq 0$ proved too difficult.

Alternatively, a simplified adaptation of the method outlined in ref. [24] was employed in [36]. We will use a solution previously obtained in [64] for the case of the general theory of $N = 2$ supergravity. For the case of Bianchi class A models, it becomes $\Psi = e^{i(F+G)+H}$, where $F \sim -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}\left[m^{ij}\psi^{(a)A}_i\psi^{(a)}_{jA} + \epsilon^{ijk}\psi^{(a)A}_i\psi^{(a)}_{kB}\mathcal{A}^B_{jA}\right]$, $G \sim \frac{i}{\Lambda}\left[m^{ij}\mathcal{A}^{AB}_i\mathcal{A}_{jAB} + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{A}^{AB}_i\mathcal{A}^C_{jB}\mathcal{A}_{kCA}\right]$, $H \sim -\left[\varepsilon^{ijk}\psi^{(a)i}_A \psi^{(a)Ak}\ A_j + \varepsilon^{ijk}A_iF_{jk}\right]$, where $\mathcal{A}_{iAB}$ are the complexified spin-connections.

In the metric representation, and for the case of a Bianchi-IX model, the 12th fermion level term, with half for each gravitino type involves a bosonic coefficient as

$$\Psi_{12}(e_{AA'i}, A_i) \sim (A^2 + A^4 + A^6)e^{-m^{ij}e^{CC'}_i e_{jCC'}}e^{\varepsilon^{ijk}A_iF_{jk}}, \tag{192}$$

where $A^2 = A_iA^i$. Other bosonic coefficients for the 8th fermionic order would include

$$\Psi_8 \sim A^4e^{-(a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2)+(a_1a_2+a_2a_3+a_3a_1)}e^{\varepsilon^{ijk}A_iF_{jk}}, \tag{193}$$

$$\Psi'_8 \sim A^4e^{-(a_1^2+a_2^2+a_3^2)+(a_1a_2-a_2a_3-a_3a_1)}e^{\varepsilon^{ijk}A_iF_{jk}}, \tag{194}$$

half for each gravitino type.

The Chern-Simons functional constitutes an exact solution to the Ashtekar-Hamilton-Jacobi equations of general relativity with non-zero cosmological constant [94]. Furthermore, the exponential of the Chern-Simons functional provides a semiclassical approximation to the no-boundary wave function in some minisuperspaces [109]. However, the exponential of the Chern-Simons functional has also been shown *not* to be a proper quantum state, because it is non-normalizable [110] (see ref. [36] and references therein for related discussions).

5 Assessment: results achieved and further research

The purposes of the present report were twofold.

On the one hand, we were committed to describe in some detail the fundamental elements and results so far achieved in the canonical quantization of supergravity theories. We restricted ourselves to a metric and fermionic differential operator representation [1]-[4], [9]-[42], [48]-[53]. We did so within the possible length assigned to these reviews.

A particular emphasis was put on supersymmetric Bianchi minisuperspaces. These are simple models obtained from a truncation on the full theory of supergravity. In spite of such limitations, these models can provide useful guidelines concerning the general theory. But the canonical quantization of supersymmetric Bianchi models was soon confronted with troublesome prospects: few or no physical states seemed to be allowed [10]-[12], [21]-[23]. This apparently implied that such minisuperspaces were useless models as far as the general theory was concerned. But a refreshing breakthrough has been recently proposed [13, 14, 24], providing the *correct* spectrum of solutions. Hence, the subject gained new momentum.

The inclusion of matter in supersymmetric FRW and Bianchi models brought further difficulties: results were apparently incompatible or incomplete [19, 27, 31, 33, 34] and no states could be found in other cases [28, 29]. However, some interesting results and recent improvements are described in ref. [33, 39, 40]. As far as (more complicated) Bianchi models derived from N=2 supergravity are concerned, these were shown *not* to preserve fermionic number due to the presence of the Maxwell field [35, 36].

The canonical quantization of the general theory was also addressed here. Premature claims for the existence of states with finite fermionic number [51, 53] were opposed by unavoidable objections [48, 49, 52]. In fact, it was shown in ref. [48, 49] that quantum states could only have an *infinite* fermionic number, in accordance with what was predicted in [52]. Such a solution was presented in ref. [50] and shown to correspond to a wormhole solution in a minisuperspace sector.

The following table summarizes the type of solutions found so far within the canonical quantization of $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ supergravities. The initials/symbols HH, WH, CS and "?″ stand for no-boundary (Hartle-Hawking), wormhole (Hawking-Page), Chern-Simmons solutions and *not yet found*, respectively. For further details, the interested reader ought to consult sections 2, 3 and 4 and the references thereby mentioned.

Models → **Solutions ↘** **Supergravity theory ↓**	$k = +1$ FRW	Bianchi class-A	Full theory
Pure N=1	HH, "WH"	HH, WH	WH
N=1 with Λ	HH	CS ↦ "WH", HH	?
N=2	—	CS	CS
N=1 with scalar fields	*not quite* HH or WH	Not WH or HH	?
N=1 with vector fields	HH, WH	?	?
N=1 with general matter	$\Psi = 0$	?	?

But on the other hand, we also wanted to motivate further research. The canonical quantization of supergravity theories is by no means a closed book. There are still many open (and serious) problems. These are waiting for adequate explanations in order to safeguard the future of the subject. Hence the subtitle *shaken not stirred*[23]: supersymmetric quantum cosmology may seem afflicted by current disapointments but if substantial energy and committment are invested, we may still achieve a sucessful outcome. We thus reach the end of this review. However, this is not the end for supersymmetric quantum cosmology. In fact, let us consider this point as an intermediate stage and bequeath a series of further tempting challenges[24] for the canonical quantization of supergravity:

- Why a comprehensible identification of the Hartle-Hawking solution for FRW models in N=1 supergravity with scalar supermultiplets [33] has been so problematic. For recent improvements see ref. [39, 40];
- Why there are *no* physical states in a locally supersymmetric FRW model with gauged supermatter [28, 29] but we can find them in a FRW model with Yang-Mills fields [34](see also ref. [115]);
- Obtaining conserved currents in supersymmetric minisuperspaces from Ψ [37]-[39]. It seems that this is not possible unless vor very simple cases (see ref. [39, 40] for more details);
- The validity of the minisuperspace approximation in locally supersymmetric models;
- Including larger gauge groups in supersymmetric FRW models with supermatter;

---

[23] British agent James Bond (OO7) usual motto when asking for his dry martini.

[24] Where the author and collaborators have been currently involved regarding some of them.

- In the approach of ref. [13, 14] the correct spectrum of solutions can only be achieved from an associated Wheeler-DeWitt equation. Could we regain the same results but directly from the supersymmetry constraint equations in [30]?

- The approach of ref. [24] produces *different* amplitudes in the same fermionic sector. But in [13, 14] the amplitude in the same fermionic sector are re-expressed in just a *single one*, which satisfies a Wheeler-DeWitt–type equation. Any relation with the above point or something else deserves further exploration?

- Obtain a satisfactory supersymmetric FRW model with just gauge fields from suitable ansätze for the vector and fermionic fields [34];

- Study the canonical quantization of black-holes in N=2 and N=4 supergravities [42] (see ref. [111, 112] for related issues);

- Perform the canonical quantization of FRW models in N=3 supergravity;

- Analyse the Chern-Simons states [24], [62]-[64], [94, 109, 110] (Recent contributions present in ref. [116, 117, 118] may prove to be useful in addressing this issue). Are these enough and physically valid? Should we (and *how*) consider other solutions?

- Describe the results and features present in ref. [73, 85] concerning finite probabilities for photon-photon scattering in N=2 supergravity but now from a canonical quantization point of view;

- Try to obtain a no-boundary (Hartle-Hawking) solution, as well as other solutions corresponding to gravitons (in the same sector) or pairs of gravitinos (in sectors differing by an even fermion number) as quantum states in the full theory [50]. It would also be important to consider the case where supermatter is present;

- Deal properly with any divergent factor present in section 2.3 and ref. [50];

- Study the canonical quantization of supergravity theories in $d > 4$ dimensions;

- The study of FRW supersymmetric minisuperspaces within a a superspace formalism has been recently brought back [119] (see ref. [20] for a former description). It would be particularly interesting (as mentioned in [119]) to consider Bianchi models and FRW models with supermatter. Namely, to see if the problems afflicting the FRW models mentioned in this review still remains.

- Another issue of interest is that the action of pure N=1 supergravity *with boundary terms* currently used [4] is *not* fully invariant under supersymmetry transformations. But a particular fully invariant action has been presented in ref. [15] for the case of Bianchi class A models. A generalization of this action for the full theory would be most welcomed [41] (see ref. [113] for a related discussion in the context of general relativity). Then proceed with the corresponding quantization and obtain physical states;

- It would also be particularly interesting to address the following (fundamental) issues of quantum gravity but now within a supersymmetric scenario: the problem of time and how classical properties may emerge. See ref. [15] and subsequently in [120] for an analysis of the problem of time in quantum supergravity. Ref. [39, 40] introduce and discuss the issue of retrieving classical properties from supersymmetric quantum cosmologies;

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges for the support of a JNICT/PRAXIS-XXI fellowship (BPD/6095/95). In addition, he is most thankfull to Dr. K K Phua (WSPC – IJMP-A) for his congenial invitation to write this review and to Ms. Lim Feng Nee (WSPC – IJMP-A) for assistance. Estimable suggestions from a IJMP-A editor/referee were also most welcomed. Comments from D. Freedman, R. Graham, H. Luckock, O. Obregon and R. Kallosh are also acknowledged. Special thanks go to A.D.Y. Cheng, A. Yu. Kamenshchik, C. Kiefer and J. Turner for their most valuable suggestions and comments. The author's knowledge and insight on the subjects of supersymmetry, supergravity and quantum cosmology are enfolded in this review; discussions and conversations enjoyed with A.D.Y. Cheng, P. D Eath, D. Freedman, G.W. Gibbons, S.W. Hawking, J.M. Izquierdo, H. Luckock, O. Obregon, G. Papadopoulos, M. Perry, R. Graham and P. Townsend since his stay in University of Cambridge were influential in his introduction and progress in those subjets. Finally, and *most important* , the author is endlessly grateful for his wife, Teresa, constant and unfailling support.

References

[1] E. S. Fradkin and M. A. Vasiliev, Phys. Lett. **72B** (1977) 70.

[2] C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 1106; Phys. Lett. **B69** (1977) 240.

[3] M. Pilati, Nucl. Phys. **B132** (1978) 138.

[4] P. D. D'Eath, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2199.

[5] A. Macias, O. Obrégon and M. Ryan, Class. Quantum Grav. **4**, 1477 (1987).

[6] O. Obrégon, J. Socorro and J. Benitez, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 4471 (1993).

[7] J. Socorro, O. Obrégon and A. Macias, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2026 (1992).

[8] A. Macias, O. Obrégon and J. Socorro, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A**8, 4291 (1993).

[9] P.D. D'Eath, S.W. Hawking and O. Obregón, Phys. Lett. **300**B, 44 (1993).

[10] P.D. D'Eath, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 713 (1993).

[11] R. Graham and H. Luckock, Phys. Rev. D **49**, R4981 (1994).

[12] M. Asano, M. Tanimoto and N. Yoshino, Phys. Lett. **314**B, 303 (1993).

[13] R. Graham and A. Csordás, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 4129;

[14] R. Graham and A. Csordás, *Nontrivial fermion states in supersymmetric minisuperspace*, in: Proceedings of the First Mexican School in Gravitation and Mathematical Physics, Guanajuato, Mexico, December 12-16, 1994, gr-qc/9506079.

[15] H. Luckock and C. Oliwa, Phys. Rev. **D. 51** (1995) 5883; C. Oliwa, M.Sc. thesis, University of Sidney (1994), unpublished.

[16] P.D. D'Eath and D.I. Hughes, Phys. Lett. **214**B, 498 (1988).

[17] P.D. D'Eath and D.I. Hughes, Nucl. Phys. B **378**, 381 (1992).

[18] P. D Eath, H.F. Dowker and D.I. Hughes, *Supersymmetric Quantum Wormholes States* in: Proceedings of the Fifth Moskow Quantum Gravity Meeting, ed. M. Markov, V. Berezin and V. Frolov, World Scientific (Singapore, 1990).

[19] L.J. Alty, P.D. D'Eath and H.F. Dowker, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 4402 (1992).

[20] D.I. Hughes, Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (1990), unpublished.

[21] P.D. D'Eath, Phys. Lett. B**320**, 20 (1994).

[22] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, Phys. Rev. D**49** (1994) 5246.

[23] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, Gravitation and Cosmology, **1** (1995) 12

[24] R. Graham and A. Csordás, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 5653.

[25] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, DAMTP-Report February R94/13,

[26] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, Gravitation and Cosmology, **1** (1995) 1

[27] A.D.Y. Cheng and P.R.L.V. Moniz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D4** (1995) 189.

[28] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, Class. Quantum Grav. **12** (1995) 1343

[29] A.D.Y. Cheng, P.D. D'Eath and P.R.L.V. Moniz, *Quantization of a FRW model in N=1 supergravity with gauged supermatter* in: Proceedings of the First Mexican School in Gravitation and Mathematical Physics, Guanajuato, December 12-16, 1994, gr-qc/9503009.

[30] P. Moniz, *Back to Basics?... or How can supersymmetry be used in simple quantum cosmological model*, DAMTP R95/20, gr-qc/9505002, Communication presented at the First Mexican School in Gravitation and Mathematical Physics, Guanajuato, Mexico, December 12-16, 1994;

[31] P. Moniz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 11** (1996) .

[32] P. Moniz, *The Case of the Missing Wormhole State*, talk presented in the 6th Moskow Quantum Gravity Seminar, 12-19 June 1995, Moskow, Russia (to appear in the Proceedings - World Scientific), gr-qc/9506042

[33] P. Moniz, Awarded Essay, Gen. Rel. Grav. **28** (1996) 97

[34] P. Moniz, *Quantization of FRW model in N=1 supergravity with gauged fields*, DAMTP Report R95/36, gr-qc/9604045

[35] A.D.Y. Cheng and P.V. Moniz, *Quantum Bianchi Models in N=2 Supergravity with Global $O(2)$ Internal Symmetry*, talk presented in the 6th Moskow Quantum Gravity Seminar, 12-19 June 1995, Moskow, Russia – to be published by World Scientific (1996).

[36] A.D.Y. Cheng and P.V. Moniz, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11** (1996) 227.

[37] R. Mallett, Class. Quantum Grav. **12** (1994) L1;

[38] O. Obregon, private communications; talk given at the GR14 conference, Florence, August 6-12 1995.

[39] P. Moniz, *Conserved currents in supersymmetric Quantum cosmology?* DAMTP R96/14.

[40] P. Moniz, *Rerum Universitas Sententia ex Susy* (A view of the Universe according to Susy), Essay written for the 1996 Gravity Research Awards, DAMTP R96/13, gr-qc/9605048

[41] H. Luckock, P. Moniz and S. Poletti, *Boundary conditions for the supergravity action*, Sydney Univ. preprint, in progress

[42] P. V. Moniz, *Canonical Quantization of Black-Holes in N=2 Supergravity*, work in progress.

[43] R. Graham, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1381 (1991).

[44] R. Graham and J. Bene, Phys. Lett. B **302**, 183 (1993).

[45] R. Graham, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 1602 (1993).

[46] R. Graham and J. Bene, Phys. Rev. D**49**, 799 (1994).

[47] R. Graham and H. Luckock, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2786 (1994).

[48] S. Carroll, D. Freedman, M. Ortiz and D. Page, Nuc. Phys. B**423**, 3405 (1994).

[49] S. Carroll, D. Freedman, M. Ortiz and D. Page, *Bosonic physical states in N=1 supergravity?* in: Procedings of the MG7 Meeting in General Relativity, Stanford, July 1994 (World Scientific), gr-qc 9410005.

[50] A. Csordas and R. Graham, *Exact quantum state for N=1 supergravity*, gr-qc/9507008.

[51] P. D. D'Eath, *Physical states in* $N = 1$ *supergravit*, DAMTP preprint, hep-th/9304084.

[52] D. Page, *Inconsistency of Canonically Quantized* $N = 1$ *Supergravity?*, (Alberta preprint Thy-28-93, hep-th/9306032)

[53] P. D. D'Eath *Phys. Lett.* **B320**, 12 (1994)

[54] G. Esposito and A. Yu. Kamenshchik, *One-Loop divergences in simple supergravity: boundary effects*, hep-th/9604182–9604194

[55] T. Jacobson, Class. Quantum Grav. **5**, 923, (1988).

[56] T. Sano and J. Shiraishi, Nucl. Phys. B**410**, 423, (1993).

[57] O. Obrégon, J. Pullin and M. Ryan, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 5642 (1993).

[58] R. Capovilla and J. Guven, Class. Quantum Grav. **11**, 1961 (1994).

[59] R. Capovilla and O. Obregon, Phys. Rev. D**49** (1994) 6562.

[60] H.-J. Matschull, Class. Quantum Grav. **11** (1994) 2395;

[61] H.-J. Matschull and H. Nicolai, Jour. Geom. Phys. **11**, 15 (1993).; Nucl. Phys. B **411**, 609 (1994); B. de Wit, H.-J. Matschull and H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 115 (1993).

[62] T. Sano and J. Shiraishi, Nuc. Phys. **B**410 (193) 423.

[63] H. Kunimoto and T. Sano, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D1** (1993) 559; Prog. Theo. Phys. **114** (1993) 31;

[64] T. Sano, *The Ashtekar Formulation and WKB Wave Function of N=1,2 Supergravity*, UT-621, hep-th/9211103.

[65] R. Gambini, O. Obregon and J. Pullin, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 615

[66] See for example, G. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, *Euclidian Quantum Gravity*, World Scientific (Singapore, 1993);

J. Halliwell, in: *Proceedings of the Jerusalem Winter School on Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universes*, edited by T. Piram et al, World Scientific, (Singapore, 1990) and refereces therein.

[67] M. Ryan and L. Sheppley, *Homogeneous Relativistic Cosmologies*, P.U.P. (New Jersey, 1975)

[68] M. Ryan, *Hamiltonian Cosmology*, Springer-Verlag (1972) L. Hughston and K. Jacobs, Astrophys. J. **160** (1970) 147

[69] A. Ashtekar, *Lectures on non-perturbative canonical gravity*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991)

[70] J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 2960 (1983).

[71] S.W. Hawking and D.N. Page, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2655 (1990).

[72] G. Esposito, *Quantum Gravity, Quantum Cosmology and Lorentzian Geometries*, Springer Verlag (Berlin, 1993).

[73] P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rep. **68** (1981) 189.

[74] P. Srivistava, *Supersymmetry, Superfields and Supergravity*, IOP (Bristol, 1986);

P. West, *Introdution to Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, World Scientific (Singapore, 1990);

D. Bailin and A. Love, *Supersymmetric Gauge Field Theory and Superstrings*, IOP (Bristol, 1994);

L. Castellani, R. d'Auria and P. Fré, *Supergravity and Superstrings*, World Scientific (Singapore, 1994)

[75] D. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Scientific American **282** (1978) 126; P.V. Moniz Homepage (URL: http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/user/prlvm10)

[76] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2nd. ed. (Princeton University Press, 1992).

[77] D. Freedman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and S. Ferrara, Phys. Rev. **D13** (1976) 3214

[78] S. Deser and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett **B62** (1976) 1035

[79] D. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976) 912

[80] S. Ferrara and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976) 1699;

[81] D. Freedman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 105

[82] D. Freedman and J. Schwarz, Nuc. Phys. **B137** (1978) 333.

[83] S. Ferrara, J. Scherk, B. Zumino, Nuc. Phys. **B221** (1977) 393.

[84] D. Freedman and A. Das, Nuc. Phys. **B120** (1977) 221.

[85] M.Grisaru, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and J.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Rev. Lett **37** (1976) 1662.

[86] S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D**37** 904 (1988).

[87] S. Sinha and B.L. Hu, Phys. rev. **D44** (1991) 1028

[88] O. Bertolami and J.M. Mourão, Class. Quantum Grav. **8** (1991) 1271

[89] O. Bertolami, J.M. Mourão, R.F. Picken and I.P. Volobujev, Int. J. Mod. Physics **A6** (1991) 4149

[90] J.E. Nelson and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **116** (1978) 86.

[91] P.D. D'Eath and J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. D **35** (1987) 1100.

[92] K. Schleich, Class. Quantum Grav. **7** (1990) 1529.

[93] P.K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 2802

[94] H. Kodama, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2548

[95] P.V. Moniz and J. Mourão, Class. Quantum Grav. **8**, (1991) 1815 and references therein.

[96] M.C. Bento, O. Bertolami, J. Mourão, P.V. Moniz and P. Sá, Class. Quantum Grav. **10** (1993) 285; G. Gibbons and A. Steif, Phys.Lett. **B320** (1994) 245

[97] P.V. Moniz, Ph.D. thesis, University of Lisbon (1993), unpublished.

[98] O. Bertolami and P.V. Moniz, Nuc. Phys. **B439** (1995) 259

[99] E. Witten and J. Bagger, Phys. Lett. B **115** (1982) 202.

[100] L. Garay, Phys. Rev. D**48** (1992) 1710.

[101] L. Garay, Phys. Rev. D**44** (1991) 1059.

[102] S.W. Hawking and D. Page, Nuc. Phys. B**264** (1986) 185.

[103] T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2471.

[104] D. Page, J. Math. Phys. **32** (1991) 3427.

[105] D. Freedman and J. Schwarz, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 1007; S. Ferrara, F. Gliuzzi, J. Scherk and P.v. Nieuwenhuizen, Nuc. Phys. **117** (1976) 333.

[106] O. Bertolami, IFM-14/90, talk presented at the XIII Int. Colloquium on Group Theoretical methods in Physics, Moskow, USSR June 1990, (Springer Verlag); J. Mourão, O. Bertolami, R. Picken and I. Volobujev, IFM Lisbon unpublished report; S. Shabanov, talk presented at the 1st Iberian Meeting on Gravity, Évora, Portugal September 1992, edited by M. Bento, O. Bertolami, J. Mourão (World Scientific Publishing, 1993); see also N. Manton, Ann. Phys. **167** (1986) 328; N. Manton, Nuc. Phys. **B193** (1981) 502.

[107] C. Isham and J. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 3226.

[108] T. Christodoulakis and J. Zanelli, Phys. Lett. **102A** (1984) 227; T. Christodoulakis and J. Zanelli, Phys. Rev. **D29** (1984) 2738; T. Christodoulakis and C. Papadopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988) 1063

[109] J. Louko, Phys. Rev. **D51**, (1995) 586

[110] G. Mena Marugan, Class. Quant. Grav. **12** (1995) 435

[111] P. Hajicek, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984) 1178;
M. Cavaglià, V. De Alfaro and A. Filipov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D4** (1995) 661
M. Cavaglià, V. De Alfaro and A. Filipov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D** (1996) to appear
D. Marolf, University of California preprint UCSBTH-95-25, gr-qc/9510023;
M. Pollock, Int. Journal Mod. Phys. **D3** (1994) 579;
K. Kuchar, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 3961

[112] G. Gibbons and C. Hull, Phys. Lett. **B109** (1982) 190;
R. Kallosh, *Supersymmetry and black holes*, hep-th 9306095;
R. Kallosh, A. Linde, T. Ortín and A. Peet, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 5278 and references therein;
S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, *N=2 Extremal Black Holes*, hep-th/9508072.

[113] C. Teitelboim *Phys. Rev. D* **25** 3159 (1982)

[114] I. M. Khalatnikov and P. Schiller, Phys. Lett. **B302** (1993) 176;
L. Amendola, I. M. Khalatnikov, M. Litterio and F. Occhionero, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 1881;
A. Yu. Kamenshchik, I. M. Khalatnikov and A. V. Toporensky, Phys. Lett. **B357** (1995) 36.

[115] H.C. Rosu and J. Socorro, *Isospectral supersymmetry in quantum cosmology* , gr-qc/9603058.

[116] R. Graham and R. Paternoga, *Physical states of the Bianchi type IX quantum cosmologies described by the Chern-Simons functional*, gr-qc/9605037

[117] R. Graham and R. Paternoga, *Exact quantum states for the Bianchi type IX model with negative cosmological constant*, gr-qc/9603027

[118] A.D.Y. Cheng and P. D Eath, *Relation between the Chern-Simons functional and the no-boundary proposal*, DAMTP R96/19

[119] O. Obregon, J.J. Rosales and V.I. Tkach, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) R1750

[120] R. Graham and H. Luckock, *Cosmological time in quantum supergravity*, gr-qc/9603054